St. Cyril of Alexandria, A New Testament Exegete

Gorgias Studies in Early Christianity and Patristics

29

In this series Gorgias publishes monographs on Christianity and the Church Fathers in the early centuries of the Christian era. Gorgias particularly welcomes proposals from younger scholars whose dissertations have made an important contribution to the field of patristics.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, A New Testament Exegete

His Commentary on the Gospel of John

Lois M. Farag

gorgias press
2014

Gorgias Press LLC, 954 River Road, Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2014 by Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2014 a

ISBN 978-1-4632-0387-0 **ISSN 1935-6870**

Reprinted from the 2007 Gorgias Press edition.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A Cataloging-in-Publication record is available from the Library of Congress.

Printed in the United States of America

To the Coptic Orthodox Church—the Church of Alexandria
and
To St. Cyril—the great Alexandrian Exegete and Theologian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents vii
Preface ix
Introduction 1
Chapter 1 11
The Years before Cyril's Episcopal Career 11
The Early Years of Cyril of Alexandria 12
Serapion the Wise 16
Cyril's Education in the Desert 22
The Important Figures Residing in the Nitrian Desert at the Time of Cyril 26
Cyril and the Position of Reader ἀναγνώστης 30
The primary and secondary education of Cyril 40
Study of Rhetoric 48
Libraries in Alexandria 49
The Alexandrian cultural milieu at the time of Cyril 51
The Date of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* 60
Conclusion 67
Chapter 2 71
The Trinity 71
Theological background 74
God 78
Trinity 82
Oneness of the Trinity 92
The Father 101
The Son 103
The Holy Spirit 132
Conclusion 144
Chapter 3 149
Cyril's Exegetical Method 149
Part One: Literary Exegesis 149
The Literary Aspect of Cyril's *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* 154

The Text as "Commentary" 155
The Division of the Commentary 157
The Division of the Gospel Text 158
Grammar 166
Geography 170
Cyril and Greek culture 174
Style 182
Argumentation with Heretics 186
Conclusion 195
Chapter 4 199
Cyril's Exegetical Method 199
Part Two: Spiritual Exegesis 199
Cyril's Understanding of the Two-Fold Exegesis 200
Arrangement and Invention 205
Cyril's use of the terms: τύπος, πνευματικός, μυστήριον, αἴνιγμα, κρύπτω, σκιαγράφος, διασκοπέω, βάθυς, σημεῖον, εἰκών, σχῆμα, θεωρία, and θεωρέω 223
τύπος 225
πνευματικός 230
μυστήριον 233
αἴνιγμα 234
κρύπτω 236
σκιαγράφος 237
διασκοπέω 238
βαθύς 238
σημεῖον 238
εἰκών 240
σχῆμα 240
θεωρία, θεωρέω 241
Cyril's use of the Old Testament Themes in his New Testament Interpretation 243
Moses 245
The Manna 247
Conclusion 252
Conclusion 255
Appendix 263
The Gospel of John 265
Bibliography 317
Index 345

PREFACE

I have always cherished St. Cyril as a major theologian in the universal church and especially in the Coptic Church. My journey with Cyril of Alexandria took a different level when I was completing my M.Div. studies at Harvard Divinity School and contemplating a doctoral degree. During a conversation with Brian Daley, S.J., I was discussing my interest to work on a topic that would address my curiosity in both Bible and Alexandrian/Coptic theology. As the conversation progressed, he mentioned that there are no scholarly works on *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* by Cyril of Alexandria. It was the perfect topic. The more I contemplated the idea the more I became enthused about it. I began my doctoral studies knowing exactly what I wanted to work on and began absorbing everything that I could regarding Cyril of Alexandria.

When I arrived at The Catholic University of America for my doctoral program, I discussed my idea with Robin Darling Young. She immediately liked the proposal and accepted to guide me through my work. Sidney Griffith, S.T. was equally interested in my topic and supported me through my program. He encouraged many initiatives and intellectual ideas beyond my academic studies. Two years later, Philip Rousseau arrived at The Catholic University of America to lead the program of Early Christian Studies. He also came on board and encouraged and facilitated many avenues for my academic growth.

Lois Farag
July 10, 2007
The Feast of St. Cyril of Alexandria

INTRODUCTION

St. Cyril of Alexandria is called "Defender of the True Faith and Apostolic Man." The Coptic Orthodox Church has given him the title "The Pillar of Faith," the Greek Orthodox Church, "Seal of the Fathers," and the Roman Catholic Church, "Doctor of the Church." All these acclamations are an indication of Cyril's contribution to the Christological development of the universal church. Scholars have studied Cyril the political bishop, Cyril the theologian, and Cyril the defender of the faith. This work will attempt to shed light on Cyril the young man who grew up and was educated in Alexandria, Cyril the student of rhetoric and Scripture, Cyril the ascetic who lived in Scetis for five years, and Cyril the theologian whose theological thought is based on his extensive study of Scripture. It is a study of Cyril the exegete who laid the foundation for Cyril the theologian.

Cyril, bishop of the Church of Alexandria from 412, acquired fame for his Christological formulations during the Nestorian debate. Not much is known about his personal life or the early years of his episcopacy. But starting in 429, Cyril became the center of ecclesial events and the focus of historians' speculations ever since. The events began in 428 when Nestorius, the bishop of Constantinople, gave a series of sermons in the imperial capital asserting that the Virgin Mary could not be called *Theotokos*—Bearer and Mother of God. His theological reasoning was that the divine person, the Word, was indwelling the human person of the man named Jesus. The Virgin Mary gave birth to the human person of Jesus, not the Incarnate Son of God, and hence she should be called *Christotokos*. These assertions caused great agitation in the city, where the clergy, monks, and the laity constantly addressed Jesus as both Christ and God. If the Virgin Mary is not the Mother of God, if she did not give birth to "God," then our salvation is in jeopardy. For according to Athanasius of Alexandria in his *On the Incarnation*, it is only God who can save us. When Arius suggested that the Son is a "created being" and "there was a time when he was not," the whole church rose to condemn such teachings. Similarly, if Mary did not give birth to "God" and is not the Mother of God, then we

cannot be saved. In the early phases of the debate Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicos, responded with a sermon in Constantinople in the presence of Nestorius during the Christmas season of A.D. 428. Nestorius in turn, launched another series of sermons accompanied with written documents expressing his theological ideas. These documents reached Cyril of Alexandria, who responded to Nestorius in writing. Though bishops such as Proclus, the laity, monks, and clergy of the capital city, and Pope Celestine of Rome and his archdeacon Leo were all watching Nestorius very carefully and confronted him in different ways, it was Cyril's writings that were to define and drive the debate for centuries. Cyril's correspondence with Nestorius, especially his *Third Letter to Nestorius* with its twelve anathemas, became the documents that defined orthodoxy.

For Cyril the core issue was Christological: it affected our understanding of the person of Christ, of the Incarnation, and hence of our salvation. In Cyril's opinion, Nestorius' formulations of the Christological union divided the person of Christ into two sons. Cyril expressed his understanding of the Incarnation as the union of two natures—divine and human nature—into the one nature of God the Word Incarnate, (μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λογοῦ σεσαρκωμένη). Cyril was also concerned with the larger picture of the Godhead. He insisted on the oneness of the person of Christ and the oneness of his nature in order to insure the oneness of the Trinity. The debate became heated and Cyril found himself at the center of escalating events that culminated with the Emperor Theodosius calling for a council in Ephesus for Pentecost of A.D. 431. Cyril emerged as a victor in this council and Nestorius was anathematized.[1]

This is the Cyril that most theologians and historians discuss. But Cyril was much more than this. Cyril was a multifaceted personality. A Christian Egyptian and a citizen of the Roman Empire, raised in the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria and trained as an ascetic in Scetis, a student of Scripture and rhetoric, Cyril became a writer, an exegete, a reader in the Church of Alexandria, a bishop of an ancient apostolic church, a pastor and shepherd, a theologian, a defender of the faith, an intellectual, and a politician.

---

[1] *Patrologiae Graeca* (hereafter PG) 77.105–122; *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (hereafter *ACO*), ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin, Liepzig, 1927*f*), 1.1.33–42. Details of the Nestorian controversy together with Cyril's role in it and the main texts that defined the debate can be found in John McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy; Its History, Theology, and Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1994). Susan Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy, the Making of a Saint and a Heretic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Cyril, a native Egyptian, was born to a Christian family in Upper Egypt and moved as a child to the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria. One of the largest cities of the Roman Empire with a port that hosted people of many ethnic backgrounds, Alexandria was the home of pagans and Jews, as well as Christians. It was a cultural city and a center for pagan and Christian learning and philosophy.[2] This was the city that Cyril called home. He was not raised in a remote, isolated town; he was rather at the center of the world—politically, ecclesiastically, culturally, and economically.

Cyril experienced the ascetic life in the desert for five years. His uncle Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, "sent him to the Mount of Nitrea" to study Scriptures.[3] We have few details about his five year stay in the Scetis of St. Macarius in the Nitrean desert. There is no historical information that would indicate that he became a monk. This would lead us to conclude that he remained in the status of "guest" during his stay in the monastic community. At the same time he was a very special guest to be given the privilege of studying Scriptures with the desert fathers. His study of Scripture entailed that he become a "disciple" to one of the desert fathers who mentored him during his studies. One can speculate that the position of his uncle Theophilus must have guaranteed special attention to his discipleship and he must have been assigned to one of the "holiest" fathers with good knowledge of scripture. As a desert resident he was required to experience and practice the asceticism, prayer, and spirituality of the desert fathers. This aspect of his life will appear in his writings and exegesis. The desert monks had an esteemed status in the Church of Alexandria and when Nestorius' ideas began arriving in Egypt, the monks were the first to receive a letter from Cyril explaining the orthodox faith.[4] Cyril was a student of the desert and a student of Scripture in the desert.

Bishop Theophilus asked Cyril to leave Scetis and return to Alexandria at the outbreak of the Origenist controversy. After his return, Cyril resumed his study of rhetoric in Alexandria. No famous teacher claimed him as a student as Libanius—the famous rhetor— claimed John Chrysostom as his student and lamented his loss to the Christians. There is no information about his teacher either in secular or ecclesiastical literature. His writings

---

[2] For a detailed study about the city of Alexandria during the time of Cyril refer to Christopher Haas, *Late Roman Alexandria, Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997).

[3] B. Evetts, trans., *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, vol. 1, *Patrologia Orientalis* (hereafter PO), ed. R. Graffin and E. Nau (Paris: Librairie de Paris, 1907), 427.

[4] PG 77.9–40. *ACO* 1.1.1.

indicate that he was highly trained in rhetoric, though he lacked appreciation for Greek philosophy. Cyril was articulate in his writings and his concern for theological precision led him to coin new words. He was a prolific writer. What is left of his writings is preserved in ten volumes of the *Patrologiae Graeca*.

Cyril's study of rhetoric together with his study of Scripture in Scetis prepared him to be an exegete. His study of rhetoric formed his method of exegesis and his study of scripture provided the subject matter. As an exegete, he was prepared to be a reader (ἀναγνώστης) in the church.[5] Readers were required to have knowledge of exegesis. As a reader, he cultivated his exegetical acumen and exegesis became the focus of his writings.

His exegetical enterprise was interrupted by the Nestorian controversy when his writings shifted towards dogmatic treatises and letters. His exegetical works and extensive writings prepared him to be clear in his theological expressions and to articulate the orthodox faith. His writings reveal a thorough knowledge of heresies that faced the church, which indicates he was well read in both heretical and orthodox literature. He was an intellectual who did not shy away from exploring and investigating ideas and other theological formulations. By the time the Nestorian controversy erupted, Cyril was an articulate rhetor, an intellect, a prolific writer, an exegete and a theologian ready to defend the faith.

After the death of his uncle Theophilus in 412, Cyril became bishop of one of the largest churches of the Early Church—the Church of Alexandria. His episcopal responsibilities were extensive. They included managing a geographically large church with many dioceses and a corresponding number of bishops. He was required to send a yearly Paschal Letter to announce the date of Easter to the universal church. As the bishop and shepherd of the city of Alexandria, he had direct pastoral responsibility for the inhabitants of the city, which included taking care of the poor, resolving family and personal disputes, and other social responsibilities.

Cyril's ecclesial duties overlapped with his political and civic responsibilities, as can be seen in the cases of the Novatians and the Jewish

[5] McGuckin, 5. F. M. Abel, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la Palestine," in *Kyrilliana: Études varées à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*, (Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947): 230. Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, The Early Church Fathers, ed. Carol Harrison (New York: Routledge, 2000), 6.

unrest. The beginning of Cyril's tenure as a bishop was relatively calm except for the problem of the Novatians, one of the many heretical groups in the city of Alexandria during his time. The newly promulgated imperial codes permitted, if not advocated, the closing of all churches that belonged to heretical groups.[6] The Code also implied that immediate action be taken: "We command that all churches shall immediately be surrendered to those bishops who confess that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are of one majesty and virtue of the same glory, and of one splendor…."[7] The Code was not limited to the physical structure of the churches used by heretical groups. It also threatened their lives. Those who disobeyed the new laws and attempted to resist the submission of their churches or insist on assembly or "provoke any agitation against the regulation of Our Tranquility, they shall know that, as authors of sedition and as disturbers of the peace of the Church, they shall also pay the penalty of high treason with their life and blood."[8] Only the bishop of the city knew whether the churches were occupied by his flock or by other, "heretical" groups. He was responsible to comply with the law and report any irregularities. The new laws of the Christianized Roman Empire required the bishops to be involved in the enforcement of the law, to the extent that the bishop of Alexandria was given a force of 500 to 600 men —*parabalani*—for this purpose.[9] The churches of the Novatians were seized, but not on Cyril's initiative. It was an imperial policy applied in most of the cities of the empire, including Rome.

Another type of unrest involved the Jewish population in Alexandria. According to Socrates, a Jewish group falsely accused a Christian of exciting the crowds on account of some dancers; they arrested and tortured him in

---

[6] Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), 440. *Th.C.* 16.1.1–4.

[7] *Th. C.* 16.1.3.

[8] *Th. C.* 16.1.4.

[9] The *Theodocian Code* provides numerous examples to the authority of the bishop such as *Th. C.* 1.27.1, which gives authority to the bishop, if parties consent, to rule in cases and his sentence will supersede that of the judge. The Code involved the bishops in all aspects of life. For the laws that guide the structure and the work of the *parabalani* refer to *Th. C.* 12.12.15*; Th. C.* 16.2.42. Also, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres festales (I-VI).* Introd. P. Évieux, texte W. H. Burns, trad. et note L. Arragon, M. O. Boulnois, P. Évieux , M. Forrat, B. Meunier. SC, vol. 37 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991), 57–61. W. Schubart, "Parabalani," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 40 (1954): 97–101. A. Philipsborn, "La campagnie d'ambulanciers 'Parabalani' d'Alexandrie," *Byzantion* 20 (1950): 185–190.

the theater. Cyril immediately contacted the Jewish leaders urging them to cease assaulting the Christians. The events escalated rather rapidly with both groups—the Christian and the Jewish—exchanging accusations. Socrates' narrative informs us that Orestes, the prefect of the city, resisted all of Cyril's attempts at reconciliation and this resistance was not received well among the monks of Nitria, who came to Alexandria to set matters straight. A series of violent events followed. Socrates writes that some of the Christians believed rumors that Hypatia, an Alexandrian female philosopher, opposed the reconciliation of Orestes and Cyril. These Christians laid in wait for her, kidnapped her, took her to a church, and killed her.[10] Cyril was blamed for Hypatia's murder though there is no evidence to support such claims.[11] This social unrest involved not only the Prefect of the city, but also Cyril as a bishop. He was the official representative of the culprit Christians and he exchanged correspondence with the emperor regarding the events. As with the case of the Novatians, Cyril in his capacity as a bishop was an important political player.

It is as bishop that Cyril wrote the dogmatic treatises devoted to the Nestorian controversy that have captured the attention of modern theologians and been the focus of most of the scholarly research. These were written by the mature Cyril. But more than seventy-five percent of Cyril's surviving writings are works of exegesis. To understand Cyril fully and to understand the scope of his thought, research should include his exegesis. Kerrigan has written a detailed study about Cyril's Old Testament interpretation.[12] But there is no comparable study of his New Testament exegesis.

---

[10] Full details of the unrest are recorded in Socrates *H.E.* 7.13–15.

[11] Pierre Évieux is of the opinion that Cyril is not responsible for the death of Hypatia. Évieux, 55–6. Beginning with the writings of Gibbon in the eighteenth century on, Cyril has been constantly accused of the murder of Hypatia and is generally portrayed as the tyrant bishop lusting for power and control. E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (New York, 1960). Though there have been some recent attempts by John McGuckin to clear Cyril of such accusations based on "balanced" scholarly research, such attempts "have called down censure in some reviews as examples of theologians having a penchant for being too kind to a villain." John McGuckin, "Cyril of Alexandria: Bishop and Pastor," in *Theology of Cyril of Alexandria*, ed. Thomas Weinandy and Daniel Keating (New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 207.

[12] A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament* (Rome: Institutum Pontificum Biblicum, 1952).

Cyril wrote on most of the New Testament books, though not much of this work has survived. He covered the Book of Acts and most of the Epistles. There is no indication that he wrote anything on the Book of Revelation.[13] There are some surviving fragments on the Gospel of Matthew, but no fragments that would indicate that he wrote a commentary on Mark.[14] The only remaining works that are almost complete are those on the Gospel of John and Luke. The commentary on Luke has survived in a Syriac translation and is in the form of homilies that were delivered after the Nestorian controversy broke out. *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* is complete except for two books in fragments. The mere fact that this commentary has survived almost intact is an indication that many generations found the commentary valuable enough to copy and preserve it until it reached our hands.

Cyril's *Commentary on the Gospel of John* is the only work of New Testament exegesis that reveals his theology and exegetical method in a comprehensive manner. John's Gospel is theological in nature and Cyril wrote his commentary with the intention of focusing on dogmatic matters. Though it is a lengthy commentary—more than one volume of *Patrologiae Graeca*—it seems to be written with a continuous, consistent thought, an indication that it was an uninterrupted writing.[15] Cyril wrote it at a time when Origenist speculations and the Arian heresy were perceived as the worst threats to the Church and he articulates his theology with these two major theological threats to the orthodox faith in mind. In doing so, he presents us with a rather comprehensive theological vision of his understanding of the Godhead, which for him means the Trinity. In addition, the text was written before the Nestorian controversy and is a good source for Cyril's theology before Nestorius. The study of the

---

[13] PG 74 includes exegetical fragments of the following texts:

Fragments on Acts	PG 74. 757–774.
" on Romans	PG 74. 774–856.
" on 1 Cor	PG 74. 856–916.
" on 2 Cor	PG 74. 916–952.
" on Hebrew	PG 74. 953–1006.
" on James	PG 74. 1008–1012.
" on 1 Peter	PG 74. 1012–1016.
" on 2 Peter	PG 74. 1018–1022.
" on 1 John	PG 74. 1022–1024.
" on Jude	PG 74. 1024.

[14] The remaining fragments on the Gospel of Matthew are in PG 72. 365–374.

[15] *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* is in PG 73 and PG 74.9–756.

commentary will answer questions about the consistency of Cyril's theology before and after Nestorius. Did the Nestorian controversy force him to rearticulate his theology? Or does the commentary reveal a Cyril who was already a mature theologian with a well formulated theological framework?

The *Commentary on John* reveals Cyril's approach to heresy and the Jews before he was part of the political scene, that is, before becoming a bishop. The text was written, as this study will prove, before Cyril's episcopal career, before he was involved in any politics, whether secular or ecclesial. He had no political motive—ecclesial or secular—for his interpretation. Cyril's commentary is a dogmatic treatise designed to prove the invalidity of heretical teachings and explain orthodox theology as presented in the Gospel. He never mentions a heresy or the founder of a heresy by name; his arguments are on the subject matter and theological in nature. As for his argument with Judaism, the commentary reveals that one aspect of his method of spiritual interpretation is to reveal the truth and meaning of the Old Testament type and its fulfillment in the New Testament. It is a theological argument, not an anti-Semitic sentiment. This is what *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* reveals to the reader.[16]

There were a few writers who wrote commentaries in Greek on the Gospel of John before Cyril. The first we know of is Origen.[17] Origen had a great influence on Cyril's exegetical method even though Cyril in his commentary writes a well thought out polemic against Origen's speculation on the ἀποκατάστασις and the pre-existence of the soul. Around A.D. 391, John Chrysostom delivered exegetical homilies on the Gospel of John.[18] Chrysostom has no influence on Cyril's commentary, however. This might be due to the difference in genre—Cyril's dogmatic exegesis versus Chrysostom's exegetical homilies—rather than to any personal dislike. Theodore of Mopsuestia also wrote a commentary on the Gospel of John, but there is no internal evidence in Cyril's commentary that he knew Theodore's work.[19] Didymus the Blind wrote a commentary on the Gospel

---

[16] Chapter Three of this text discusses Cyril's method of heretical argumentation and Chapter Four discusses Cyril's Spiritual Exegesis and the fulfillment of the Old Testament type in the truth of the New Testament.

[17] Origen's commentary was produced in four volumes of the series Source Chrétiennes. Origène, *Commentaire sur S. Jean*, trans. Cécil Blanc, Sources Chrétiennes, v. 120, 157, 222, 290 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1966–1992).

[18] PG 59.23–482.

[19] PG 66.728–785. *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis Apostoli*, ed. J.-M. Vosté Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium, v. 115, 116 (Louvain: Secrétariat du corpus SCO, 1940).

of John that has survived only in fragments.[20] Cyril's commentary reveals a strong continuity of thought between the two Alexandrian writers. There is, then, a strong Alexandrian influence on Cyril's theology and exegetical method. Cyril's *Commentary on John* was not an isolated exercise on his part. It shows that he walked in the footsteps of two colossal exegetes—Origen and Didymus. And as this study will demonstrate, Cyril puts into effect the theology of another, unsurpassed Alexandrian theologian—Athanasius of Alexandria.

Important for his contemporaries, Cyril's commentary remains significant for present day theologians. Cyril was a theologian who formulated his theology based on the biblical text while employing the art of rhetoric. It is crucial to understand the exegesis that was instrumental in formulating Cyril's theology. It is also critical to view his later dogmatic treatises in light of his earlier writings. Cyril became the standard of orthodoxy, yet interpreting his writings has caused centuries of debate. The commentary raises points such as the oneness of Christ in his nature and in operation and his oneness within the Trinity that would become instrumental at the Council of Ephesus and later. Cyril's triumph at Ephesus and the acceptance of his theology centuries later can be attributed primarily to his persuasive theological vision. The vision began in *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. The study of Cyril's commentary is therefore crucial.

The present work portrays Cyril as theologian and exegete through an examination of his *Commentary on John*. It begins with an attempt to place Cyril and his commentary within their context. Chapter One begins with the writer and his childhood. It attempts to view Cyril in a more comprehensive way, beginning with the few sources available that shed light on his early years. It follows Cyril's move from southern Egypt to Alexandria in the north and reconstructs his stay in Alexandria during his early years. The chapter explores the state of Scetis during the time of Cyril's stay in the desert and investigates the identity of "Serapion the Wise," whom sources say was Cyril's teacher, together with other fathers dwelling in the desert who might have had influence on Cyril and his study of Scripture. It also investigates the position of reader (ἀναγνώστης) , which Cyril occupied on his return to Alexandria. Readers were biblical exegetes with some level of secular education, so this chapter looks at the educational system at the time of Cyril. It also looks at the cultural resources and libraries of Alexandria together with the resources at the

[20] PG 39.1645–54.

patriarchal residence that were at Cyril's disposal. Putting all this information together the chapter concludes with a proposed date for *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*.

Chapter Two discusses Cyril's understanding of the Trinity which constitutes the main framework within which Cyril forms his theology. When Cyril speaks in the commentary about the Godhead, he speaks about the Trinity. Chapter Two investigates Cyril's articulation in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John* of Trinitarian theology and the relationship of each person within the Trinity: all things are *from* the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Spirit.

Chapters Three and Four discuss Cyril's exegetical method in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Chapter Three begins by exploring the literary genre of a commentary followed by the literary and theological divisions of the Gospel text as used in the commentary. Part of understanding the literary aspect of the commentary is to understand the rhetorical method that Cyril uses by investigating its grammar, geography, philosophy, style, and rhetorical argumentation. Chapter Four explores the spiritual aspects of Cyril's exegesis by exploring his use of the rhetorical tools of arrangement and invention. This is followed by a detailed study of Cyril's terminology and use of Old Testament themes in his exegesis.

The commentary that Cyril wrote on the Johannine Gospel reveals his exegetical method and his strong Trinitarian theology. He approaches the Gospel text both literally and spiritually. He begins with the literal meaning and then directed his readers to the deeper, spiritual, hidden, and enigmatic meaning of the text. Cyril's spiritual interpretation aims to reveal the type of Christ, contemplate the mystery, and discover the deep and hidden meaning of scripture. The Trinity is the framework within which Cyril articulates his understanding of the Incarnation and redemption. The unity and the oneness of Christ are preserved at all times and under all conditions. The indivisibility and oneness of the Son has to be preserved not only within his own nature but also within the Trinity. The commentary also reveals the nature and work of the Holy Spirit. The indwelling of the Spirit is the beginning of the newness of life.

CHAPTER 1

THE YEARS BEFORE CYRIL'S EPISCOPAL CAREER

St. Cyril is considered one of the greatest theologians and exegetes of the Church of Alexandria. He became pope[21] and bishop of the Church of Alexandria in A.D. 412. Cyril's fame escalated with the beginning of the Nestorian controversy and he remained a prominent theologian of the universal Church until the time of his death in A.D. 444. Most ancient historians and modern scholars have been primarily concerned with the period of his fame during his episcopacy leaving the period before his episcopal career scantily treated.[22] In addition, Cyril's writings reveal only minor amounts of personal information. This information is gleaned from a few remarks and dates in his personal correspondence with the disputing parties of the Nestorian controversy, and his *Festal Letters*.

In fact, the only definite dates we have about Cyril are the date of his episcopacy, A.D. 412–444, and that he accompanied his uncle Theophilus to the Synod of the Oaks in A.D. 403. This is one of the rare occasions where Cyril mentions in his writings something that is pertinent to his person. In fact, being at the Synod in A.D. 403 is the only sure date that we have before his episcopal appointment. In his letter to Bishop Acacius Cyril writes: "However, I want your holiness to recall something worthwhile which pertains to the present time. For when in the great city of Constantinople, your holy synod was gathered at the time when John [Chrysostom] was accused, and later when there were statements composed

---

[21] For brief references to documents attributing the title "pope" to the bishop of Alexandria refer to Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, The Early Church Fathers, ed. Carol Harrison, (New York: Routledge, 2000), 208.

[22] For Cyril's contemporary writers see the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Socrates and Sozomen. For Coptic writers refer to the seventh century chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu and the tenth century *History of the Patriarchs* by Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien. For modern scholars who wrote general introductory biographies of Cyril refer to the studies of Wilken, McGuckin, and Russell.

in writing by men concerning him, when it might come about that a definition against him would be the result, and I was one of the bystanders [κἀγὼ ἐτύγχανον τῶν ἑστηκότων εἷς], I know that I heard your holiness speaking in the following words to the Synod, 'If I knew that, if we granted forgiveness to John, he would be better disposed within himself and would depart from the hardness which is in him, I would beseech you all in his behalf.'"[23] Another indication that Cyril was present at the Synod is insinuated by the letter sent by Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, to Cyril concerning John Chrysostom's title restored to the diptych. Atticus writes: "But learn for what reason I send these letters. Your holiness somehow thoroughly knew, or rather has been seen by those eyes with which our saintly father, the most God-loving Theophilus, saw, what kind and how great a disorder seized the capital city and that the pious faith was in danger of being shaken apart from the depth."[24]

Due to the sketchy information about the early period in Cyril's life, his childhood is shrouded in silence and mystery. But these formative years are crucial in understanding Cyril's writings and determining the date of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Therefore, we will give special attention to the early years of Cyril. These years will give us an understanding of his intellectual formation, including his education and the tutors who had the greatest effect on his youth.

The Early Years of Cyril of Alexandria

There are very few existing sources that offer any biographical information concerning Cyril. For the years prior to the episcopacy we are dependent on the writings of John, the seventh century Bishop of Nikiu, and Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien, who compiled his *History of the Patriarchs* in the tenth century. John, Bishop of Nikiu, informs us that Cyril's mother and her brother Theophilus were born of Christian parents in the southern Egyptian city of Memphis. When their parents died at an early age, their Ethiopian slave left Memphis and headed north, where her last destination was the city of Alexandria. She entered the church in Alexandria, where Pope Athanasius was preaching. He noticed them and ordered that they would be detained until he could speak with the three visitors. He baptized

[23] E. Shwartz, *ACO* 1.1.7, p148, 31–36. PG 77.157. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard (Turnhout, 1974–80), 5333. J. I. McEnerney, trans., *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters*, Fathers of the Church, vol. 76 (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 130–1.

[24] Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr.* 1431, p23. McEnerney, 77:83–4.

the Ethiopian woman, Theophilus and his sister and from that time on Athanasius became their benefactor.[25] Theophilus became a disciple of Athanasius and his sister was sent to live with the nuns until the day of her marriage.[26] Theophilus' sister got married and settled in the town of Mahalle, where she gave birth to Cyril.[27] John, Bishop of Nikiu, adds that Theophilus baptized his nephew and appointed Cyril an *anagnostes* and saw that he learned the Holy Scriptures.[28] The interval of time between the child's baptism and being appointed to the rank of *anagnostes* is not specified. However, the narrative shows the interest of Theophilus in his nephew's welfare from the very early years of the child.

Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien, is a famous tenth century Coptic historian and scholar. He wrote a *History of the Patriarchs*, namely the patriarchs of the Church of Alexandria. Under the life of Pope Theophilus, he gave a lengthy account about the upbringing of the young Cyril. This narrative arrangement makes us understand that Severus considered the education and upbringing of Cyril as part of Theophilus' achievement in the patriarchate rather than part of Cyril's life.[29] Severus possibly intended to

---

[25] There is no specific reason given as to why Theophilus and his sister being born of Christian parents were not baptized in their infancy. The baptism of children in early Christianity was frequently delayed. This seems to persist till the sixth century. To point to one example, we can mention the case of Severus of Antioch who was not baptized until he was an adult.

[26] Robert Henry Charles, ed., *The Chronicle of John, Coptic Bishop of Nikiu (c.690 A.D.) Being the History of Egypt Before and During the Arab Conquest*, Text and Translation Society, London, vol. 3 (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1907), 75–6.

[27] Munier identified the city of Mahalle to be the city of Mahallet el-Borg about half a kilometer north of Mahallet el Kobra. *Kyrilliana: Études variées à l'occasion du Xve centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*, (Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947), 199–201. Abel suggests 378 to be the date of Cyril's birth and most scholars accepted this date though Abel does not give any arguments for this suggestion. *Kyrilliana*, 230.

[28] Charles, 76. John of Nikiu refers to three more episodes in Cyril's life. The enrollment of John Chrysostom's name to the dyptich, the Nestorian controversy, and the death of Hypatia. John is mainly dependent on Socrates' history for details concerning Hypatia's death.

[29] This work will attribute the *History of Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria* to Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien. Some scholars argued that Severus is a "compiler" or "collector" rather than the author of the lives of the Patriarchs mentioned in the History. For further details on this point refer to D. W. Johnson, *Coptic sources of the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, Ph.D. Thesis, The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C., 1974. Also Johnson's further

point to Theophilus' interest in education and give special regard to the idea of passing on tradition from one Alexandrian bishop to his successor. Severus begins his account by mentioning that Theophilus brought up his nephew Cyril "to the best of his power."[30] He continues to explain what Theophilus did for his nephew. Severus writes:

> And after some time the patriarch sent him to the Mount of Nitria, to the desert of Saint Macarius. And Cyril dwelt there five years in the monasteries, reading the books of the Old and New Testaments; for Theophilus urged him to apply himself assiduously to his studies, saying to him: "By these studies thou wilt some day arrive in Jerusalem on high, which is the dwelling-place of the saints." For Cyril was the attendant of Theophilus in the patriarchal cell, and was ordained reader. The patriarch, when he sent Cyril to the desert, entrusted him to Serapion the Wise, and charged him to teach Cyril the doctrines of the Church, which are the true doctrines of God; so Cyril learnt all the Scriptures by heart. He used to stand before his teacher studying, with a sword of iron in his hand; and if he felt an inclination to sleep, he pricked him with the sword, and so he woke up again; and during most of his nights he would read through in a single night the Four Gospels, and the Catholic Epistles, and the Acts, and the first Epistle of the Blessed Paul, namely, that addressed to the Romans; and on the morrow after this, Cyril's teacher would know, by looking at his face, that he had studied all night. And the grace of God was with Cyril, so that when he had read a book once, he knew it by heart; and in these years in the desert he learnt by heart all the canonical books.[31]

Severus continued by explaining that Cyril was summoned back to the patriarchate this being an indication that Theophilus was occupied in making decisions for his nephew, another sign of attentive upbringing. Severus continues his narrative,

> After this, the patriarch Theophilus sent to him and brought him back to Alexandria, and there Cyril dwelt with the patriarch in

---

research, *Further remarks on the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, OC 61 (1977): 103–116. Johannes Den Heijer has summarized all arguments that oppose or agree with the thesis of authorship in his work *Mawhub Ibn Mansur Mufarrig et l'historiographie Copto-Arabe: Étude sur la composition de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie*, CSCO 83 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 93–96.

[30] B. Evetts, trans., *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, vol. 1, *Patrologia Orientalis*, ed. R. Graffin and E. Nau (Paris: Librairie de Paris, 1907), 427.

[31] Ibid., 427–8.

> his cell, and read aloud in his presence; and the priests and learned men and philosophers were astonished at him, and rejoiced over him on account of the beauty of his form, and the sweetness of his voice which never changed, as it is written: "I opened my mouth and drew in my breath." And all the people, when they heard him read, desired that he might never cease reading, because he read so sweetly, and was so beautiful in countenance. And his uncle Theophilus loved him greatly, and thanked God that he had granted him a spiritual son who had grown in grace and wisdom. Cyril's conduct was excellent, and his humility was great; and he never ceased to study theology, nor to meditate upon the words of the doctors of the orthodox Church, Athanasius, Dionysius, and Clement, patriarch of Rome, and Eusebius, and Basil, bishop of Armenia, and Basil, bishop of Cappadocia. These are the orthodox fathers whose works he studied. And he would not follow the doctrine of Origen…."[32]

Severus' revealing account has not received much attention from scholars and was dismissed by others.[33] Nevertheless, a careful study of this quote will reveal that it is carefully worded and is a result of a meticulous study. The following points will be investigated: the identity of "Serapion the Wise," who was the tutor of Cyril during his presence in the desert; the date of Cyril's presence in the desert and the important figures residing in Nitia during that time; the education Cyril received from Serapion in the Nitrian desert with specific attention to the study of scripture and the role of the teacher-disciple in the monastic setting; the reason why Cyril was summoned from the desert after five years; the implication of Cyril's position of reader upon his return; and the continuation of his secular education in the patriarchal cell after his return from the Nitrian desert. After investigating all of these points we will end the chapter with the conclusion of why and when Cyril wrote his commentaries, including that on the Gospel of John.

---

[32] Ibid., 429.

[33] Wickham dismisses Severus' account, based on his strong personal opinion, where he states that it is "a tissue of legends and misunderstood facts." He does not give any scholarly justification for refuting Severus' account. Lionel R. Wickham, ed. and trans., *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters* (Oxford Early Christian Tests, ed. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1983), xii-xiii

Serapion the Wise

Based on Severus' comment quoted above, Kerrigan writes, "According to Severus, Cyril had Macarius and Serapion of Thmuis as his masters."[34] However, a careful reading of Severus shows that it was the "desert of Saint Macarius" not Macarius as a person who is mentioned. In addition, Serapion of Thmuis, Cyril's teacher, was not conclusively identified as the same person as Serapion the Wise. Though Kerrigan misreads Severus' comment, he concludes that Severus' account cannot be correct based on chronological calculations, and the only possible teacher of Cyril is Isidore of Pelusium. This conclusion is based upon the close relationship exhibited in Isidore's letter of reproof to Cyril.[35] In general, all these propositions represent an effort to uncover Cyril's early teacher or teachers and the source of his education, whether on the spiritual and biblical, or the scholastic level. Thus, we will discuss the options of either Serapion of Thmuis, Serapion the Wise, or Isidore of Pelusium as Cyril's possible instructors.

Serapion of Thmuis (died after 360) was also known as *Scholasticus*. He was a friend of St. Athanasius and St. Antony of Egypt. In the life of St. Antony, written by St. Athanasius, we understand that St. Antony left to each—Serapion and Anthanasius—one sheepskin. The sheepskin is considered a valuable and most personal memento of a person, therefore signifying the close relationship between St. Antony and his two disciples and their special endearing status among his numerous followers. Serapion was the father of a group of monks before his ordination as bishop of Thmuis. Serapion was a prolific writer, his most famous exposition being a treaty against the Manicheans entitled *Contra Manichaeos*. In addition to a doctrinal treatise on the divinity of the Holy Spirit, he composed another significant writing, *The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis*, also known as the *Euchologion*.[36]

It is plausible to envision Serapion of Thmuis as the teacher of Cyril for several reasons. He was a *Scholasticus* and thus was extremely suited to

---

[34] A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament* (Rome, Institutum Pontificum Biblicum, 1952), 10.

[35] Ibid.

[36] For further reference to the life and works of Serapion consult: J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 3 (Texas: Christian Classics, A Division of Thomas More Publishing, n.d.), 80–85. Henry Wace and William C. Piercy, *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography* (Hendrickson, 1999), 889. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (New York: The Oxford University Press, 1998), 1485.

fulfil the role of Cyril's tutor and mentor. Second, he was a monk, and therefore could have contributed to Cyril's scholarly education a biblical dimension that is clearly present in his work. Next, he was a good friend of Athanasius and was entrusted with a letter to Constantius that refutes the Arian controversy. In addition to this last point, the proposition that Serapion of Thmuis is Cyril's tutor also accounts for Cyril's great literary interest in the Arian controversy, because Serapion was a great friend of both Athanasius and Antony who were both the greatest defenders of the faith against Arianism. Finally, both Serapion and Cyril share an interest in liturgy as evidenced in their writings.[37] These factors suggest that Serapion of Thmuis is Cyril's teacher, and is Cyril's educator in Greek "paideia." Nonetheless, the chronological difficulty is so strong that this proposal must be rejected. Although we do not know the exact birth date of Cyril, the suggested date is 378. Whatever margin of error might exist, it cannot compensate for the huge gap of eighteen years to the time of Serapion's death around 360.[38] Therefore, Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, could not have been a teacher of Cyril.

The identity of Serapion the Wise provides yet another challenge.[39] Another famous Serapion is the one referred to as *sindonites* (σινδονίου).[40] Our main source of information about Serapion the Sindonites comes from Palladius' *The Lausiac History*. Palladius mentions that "he is highly literate [εὐγράμματος]," [41] and it is known that he knew Sacred Scripture by heart. Serapion was an Egyptian ascetic who would repeatedly sell himself into slavery in order to save souls. He sailed to Rome with the intention of

---

[37] The text of Cyril's liturgy can be found in PG 77. The Coptic Church still uses the liturgy attributed to Cyril to the present day.

[38] Adding another ten years until Cyril is of a suitable age to grasp any level of education beyond the elementary level.

[39] There are two other Serapions that could easily be dismissed. The first Serapion, a penitent of Alexandria is an unlikely candidate to be a teacher of Cyril. Chronologically, he lived during the Decian persecution and renounced the faith and was penitent for the rest of his life. The second Serapion, Bishop of Heraclea, is Egyptian by birth. He was ordained deacon by Chrysostom. At the very end of his life he was excommunicated and exiled to Egypt during the time of Theophilus. His life story is most ill reputed. Theophilus would not put his nephew under the supervision of either a penitent or an excommunicated heretic. Sozomen *HE* 6.28; 8.9; 8.19. For more details on the lives of both Serapions see Wace, 889, 890.

[40] *Sindonites* so called because of the linen cloth he always wore.

[41] Dom Cuthbert Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1898), 109. Robert T. Meyer, trans., *Palladius: The Lausiac History*, vol. 34, Ancient Christian Writers (New York: The Paulist Press, n.d.), 105, 199.

visiting other ascetics but died during his visit and was buried in the city. The Latin martyrolgies make him the bishop of Thmuis.[42] His literacy, good knowledge of Scripture, and ascetic life suggest that he could possibly be a candidate to be Cyril's teacher. Nevertheless, his lifestyle consisted of constant travel, and the possibility of coming from the Pachomian monastic tradition made him a most unsuitable candidate for Cyril's tutor.[43] Theophilus was associated with the Nitrean monastic tradition more so than to any other. In addition, the constant travel of Serapion does not fit the profile of a tutor who could have long term students, or any student.

There was another anchorite in Scetis by the name of Serapion who lived at the time of Theophilus, but there is only a remote probability that he would be Serapion the Wise, the tutor of Cyril. There is no mention of his scholarly ability or even his knowledge of writing. The other reason that would make him the least likely candidate to tutor Cyril, is that he was a leader in the Anthropomorphite movement in Scetis that disagreed with Theophilus' *Festal Letter* concerning the topic.[44] Though he later repented, this would not have made him one of Theophilus' favorites. Therefore, he would not have been likely to entrust him with Cyril's education.

The last famous character in Scets by the name of Serapion is Serapion the Great.[45] He was the companion of St. Macarius the Great and the author of the Coptic hagiography of St. Macarius.[46] The hagiography shows that he was a witness to the conversation between St. Macarius and St.

---

[42] Wace, 889.

[43] Meyer comments that Syriac manuscripts mention that Serapion died "at the convent of Pachomius in the desert." Meyer, *Lausiac History*, 199. He is not to be confused with Serapion, Bishop of Dendara (Nitentori), who sought the ordination of Pachomius to the priesthood during the visit of St. Athanasius to the Pachomian monasteries at the beginning of his episcopacy.

[44] Letters of A.D. 401 and 402. The Latin translations of these letters are found in Jerome's *Epistle* 96 (CSEL 55.159), *Epistle* 98 (CSEL 55.185), and *Epistle* 100 (CSEL 55.213). However, it is *Epistle* 92 that anathematized Origen's writings. Jerome *Epistle* 92.1 (CSEL 55.148).

[45] For Serapion the Great, I am basically dependent on Father Matta-El-Meskeen's research. Matta-El-Meskeen, *Coptic Monasticism in the Age of St. Macarius* (Nitrean Desert: Monastery of St. Macarius Press, 1984), 270–1.

[46] Some manuscripts added to the author Serapion, the title "bishop of Themuis" because of the fame of the latter. But Amelineau definitely concluded that the author is Serapion the Great. In addition, Butler affirmed the conclusion of Amelineau. Matta-El-Meskeen, 270.

Antony.[47] After the death of St. Antony, he left the Eastern Desert and moved westward to the Nitrian Desert—Scetis—and remained with his friend St. Macarius until the latter's death. Sozomen mentions Serapion the Great as one of several prominent monks in Scetis, together with the other two Macariuses, who preserved the Nicean faith at the time of St. Athanasius.[48] Jerome mentions his name as one of the "pillars of Christ" whom he visited with Paula in 386.[49] We do not know when or at what age Serapion died, although we do know that he wrote the life of St. Macarius who died at the age of ninety-seven in 397. It might have taken him several years to write the biography of St. Macarius. At the time that Theophilus wrote his famous letter against the Anthropomorphites, Serapion was still alive. Cyril would have been at the age of twenty-two when Theophilus wrote his letter to Scetis.

Therefore, if we assume that Cyril had his private scholastic education until the age of seventeen when his uncle Theophilus sent him to Scetis, then it is most probable that he was discipled under Serapion the Great. The latter was famous for his steadfast Nicean faith, the friend of three famous ascetics namely St. Athanasius, St. Antony, and St. Macarius. In addition, he was famous for his piety and considered a "pillar" in the desert. Serapion the Great was a man of considerable intellect and had the ability to compose a hagiographic text about his spiritual brother St. Macarius. These factors must have been excellent assets in making him a suitable teacher for the young Cyril. At the age of fifteen, Cyril must have acquired an advanced amount of scholastic education and it was time for him to become grounded in the spiritual and biblical disciplines.[50] He stayed for five years in the desert, until the year 400 when the turmoil and Anthropomorphic turbulence hit Scetis. Theophilus found this a suitable time to summon his nephew to the Patriarchate in Alexandria. Thus, Serapion the Wise, the "pillar of Christ," was most likely the spiritual father of Cyril and the one who opened his intellectual horizons to the biblical world, and instructed him in the monastic way of life.

---

[47] Sozomen writes that Serapion is one of the contemporaries of St. Antony and who later went to Scetis after the death of his father, St. Antony. Sozomen *HE* 6.30.

[48] Sozomen *HE* 3.14.

[49] He is mentioned as of equal status to Macarius and Arsenius. Jerome *Epistle* 108. (CSEL 55.324). St. Macarius moved to Scetis in 385. Thus, Serapion was already a well renowned monastic when he moved to Scetis.

[50] The scholastic education of Cyril will be discussed later in this chapter and in following chapters.

It is necessary to make a final note regarding the thesis proposed by Kerrigan that Isidore of Pelusium could be Cyril's tutor. As previously mentioned, the thesis is based on Isidore's letter of reproof to Cyril claiming that no one would write such a hard criticism of Cyril had he not been in close relationship with him and most probably Cyril's tutor. However, a closer look at the character and style of Isidore's writing will give us a better understanding of his person and literary activity. He was born in Alexandria in the fifth century and his writings indicate that he read Greek poets, historians, orators, and philosophers.[51] He became a monastic, following the Pachomian rule and at a certain point in his life was appointed a presbyter. It is debated whether he was part of or the founder of a monastic community in Pelusium. During Isidore's lifetime there was a certain Eusebius, Bishop of Pelusium, who was the center of an ecclesiastical scandal. Perhaps this is the breaking point at which Isidore used his literary sword to respond to clerical vice and abuse of the episcopal position. Some excerpts from his writings might give us an indication of his character. Alluding to Eusebius's love of church-building, he says:

> "It was not for the sake of walls, but for the sake of souls, that the King of Heaven came to visit us." "Could I have chosen, I would have rather lived in apostolic times, when church buildings were not thus adorned but the church was decked with grace, than in these days, when the buildings are ornamented with all kinds of marble, and the church is bare and void of spiritual gifts."[52]

Isodore accuses church shepherds of the following:

> "Once shepherds would die for their flocks; now they destroy the sheep by causing the soul to stumble…. Once they distributed their goods to the needy; now they appropriate what belongs to the poor. Once they practiced virtue; now they ostracize (ἐξοστρακίζουσι) those who do…. [But] I will not accuse (αἰτιάσομαι) *all*."[53]

Isidore's sharp criticism is not limited to the bishops. He addresses the priests as follows:

> Some… openly reproach priests; others pay them outward respect but in secret revile them…. This does not surprise *me*. As they do not act like those of old, they are treated differently. Those of old corrected kings when they sinned; these do not correct even rich subjects; and if they try to correct some poor

[51] Wace, 545.

[52] Isodore of Pelusium *Epistle* ii.246 (PG 78.634–5).

[53] Ibid., *Ep.* iii.223 (PG. 905–8).

> man, they are reproached as having been convicted of the same offences.[54]

Isidore actually followed the advice that he gave to others and "corrected kings." He advises Theodosius II to "combine mildness with authority."[55] He adds "He who has been invested with rule ought himself to be ruled by the laws; if he himself sets them aside, how can he be a lawful ruler?"[56] He also rebuked Pulcheria for the envoys who "compromised their Christianity in the negotiation of a peace."[57] Lest one think that he is attentive only to those in power, Isidore addresses every fault he finds in others, including inhospitality and gluttony. He was equally sharp in his criticism of monks who did not do manual labor and visited cities where all that the "angelic life" required was "a cloak, a staff, and a beard."[58] No wonder every one was careful when dealing with him, and that he developed many enemies in high places.

Within this context we can understand Isidore's letter to Cyril. This letter was written when Cyril was at the council of Ephesus trying to defeat the Nestorian heresy. Isidore wrote to Cyril:

> Prejudice does not see clearly; antipathy does not see at all. If you wish to be clear of both these affections of the eyesight, do not pass violent sentences, but commit causes to just judgment. God… was pleased to 'come down and see' the cry of Sodom, thereby teaching us to inquire accurately. For many of those at Ephesus accuse you of pursuing a personal feud, instead of seeking the things of Jesus Christ in an orthodox way."[59]

Isidore has appointed himself and his pen to be the judging sword of Christendom, from the king to the least Christian faithful. Cyril was a target and part of his campaign of criticism aimed equally at king and monk. Understanding Isidore's character clarifies for us why Cyril accepted his criticism. Not because Isidore was his tutor, but rather this was Isidore at his best. Cyril understood his character, and therefore was not offended by his harsh remarks.

---

[54] Ibid., *Ep.* v.278 (PG 78.1500).
[55] Ibid., *Ep.* i.35 (PG 78.197).
[56] Ibid., *Ep.* v.383 (PG 78.1556–7).
[57] Ibid., *Ep.* iv.143 (PG 78.1224–5).
[58] Ibid., *Ep.* i.92 (PG 78.245).
[59] Ibid., *Ep.* i.30 (PG 78.361).

Cyril's Education in the Desert

In the monastic tradition of the Egyptian desert, a spiritual father took great care to hand down the tradition to his disciples through the repetitive narration of the elders' stories. Monasticism had a great impact upon the church. It is not coincidental that St. Athanasius resorted to St. Antony to come down to Alexandria to calm the people during the Arian controversy and restore peace to the church. Athanasius' continuous visits to monastic gatherings in the Nitrean desert and along the River Nile were a demonstration of Athanasius' belief in the impact of monasticism on the church and the faithful.[60] If he was assured that the faith of the monks is orthodox, then he was assured that the rest of the church would follow in their footsteps.[61] Theophilus understood this very well, and made constant visits to the Nitrean desert. Moreover, he maintained a close relationship with many of the desert dwellers. In fact, he even sent his nephew to be tutored by one of its fathers. When Cyril was confronted with the Nestorian controversy, his first letter was addressed to the monks.[62] Cyril understood their importance—he knew that the monks were the first to be addressed in such a theological controversy. When a new pope is ordained for the See of Alexandria, one of his first tasks is to visit the Nitrean desert. This tradition was kept in the church and developed into a patriarchal custom for centuries to come.[63] If the desert suffered from any heresy, theological ignorance, or instability of any kind, the church was always affected. The desert provided leadership, a source of spiritual rejuvenation, the passing down of tradition, and the preservation of the orthodox faith. The continuous history of Egyptian monasticism and its interaction with the church of Alexandria proves this observation.

---

[60] In *The Life of Saint Pachomius* it is mentioned that after only one year of the appointment of Athanasius as bishop of Alexandria, he made a long trip to the south to visit all the churches. This included visits to Pachomian monasteries on the river Nile. Armand Veilleux, trans., *Pachomian Koinonia*. Vol.1, *The Life of Saint Pachomius* (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1980), 51.

[61] David Brakke, has interpreted the Athanasian visits as a means of exerting control on monasticism; however more attention needs to be given to the pastoral dimension of these visits and their theological impact on Christian masses who are ready to believe in what the monk or "holy man" believes in. David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford & New York, 1995).

[62] *ACO* 1.1.1 pp10–23; CPG 5301; J. I. McEnerney, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters*, Fathers of the Church, vol. 76 (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 13–33.

[63] Metta-El-Meskeen, 432.

Therefore, a closer look at the education in the desert will shed light on the milieu that nourished Cyril's mind, the milieu that functioned as a conscience to Cyril, and the milieu that fed and shaped the spiritual life of the Church in which Cyril resided.

The monastic life is primarily concentrated on living the commandments. Thus, scripture became the nourishment and the center force of the monastic life. The *Sayings* speak of a monk who lived in his cell for twenty years. One day he decided to sell all his books and travel to the inner desert. Abba Isaac met him and inquired about his destination. The monk answered that he had been reading the books, that is, scripture, for twenty years and now he decided to begin putting what he learned into practice.[64] Reading scripture was a major activity of the monastic life, but the emphasis on applying what one reads is the aim of all this reading. Reading scripture is for the illumination of the soul and the mind.[65] The constant reading and memorization of scripture was an activity that had a spiritual aim. Reading scripture was intertwined with the daily monastic life and activities. John Clobus advises the brothers "to read an hour, pray an hour and work an hour."[66] Meanwhile, St. Climados advised the brothers to stay in the cell and read with understanding and comprehension and with a mind that gives glory to God.[67] St. Epiphanius said that meditation in scripture is a great treasure that keeps a person from sin and encourages the person for doing what is righteous.[68] Therefore, Cyril lived in a milieu that promoted the memorization of scripture, put what was memorized into practice, and used the reading as a source of one's meditation. This spiritual

[64] *Paradise of the Fathers* (Diocese of Beni Suef and Bahnasa, 1977), 390.

[65] John Clobus' instruction to his disciple. *Paradise*, 370. Burton-Christie gives an example of scholars who did not understand the significance of scriptural memorization. Burton-Christie writes: "Hans Lietzmann illustrates well the tendentious attitude which has sometimes characterized the Protestant approach towards monasticism and especially towards its use of Scripture. Speaking of the practice of memorization of Scripture in early monasticism, Lietzmann says, 'It should of course be understood that this learning by heart was nothing more than a superficial accomplishment, ascetic in character, a kind of weaving and mental matting…. The mechanical memorization did not penetrate the heart; it gave indeed only the faintest biblical tinge to the world of ideas in which the monks lived." Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert*: *Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 13–4.

[66] *Paradise*, 370.

[67] Ibid., 131.

[68] Ibid., 389.

scriptural exercise in connection to daily practice gave the contemplative person illumination of the soul and mind.

The impact of this is obvious in Cyril's writings. His extraordinary knowledge of scripture is evident from his writings and from his choice of writing scriptural commentaries on both the Old and the New Testaments. His love of scripture is manifested in the fact that seventy-five percent of his surviving literature is scriptural exegesis.[69] This knowledge of scripture and its practical implication in addition to his stay in the desert left a print on his soul and is reflected in his writings.

The exercise of practical renunciation in the desert according to scripture cast an enduring effect on the writings of Cyril. An example of the enduring impact of renunciation was portrayed in his writings on poverty. St. Cyril commenting on Jn 9:11 writes about the blind man who was healed by Jesus Christ and, when asked by the Jewish leaders, answered that he did not know the identity of his healer. Cyril comments that, based on rumors in Jerusalem about the miracles done by Christ, the blind man most probably thought a holy man healed him. Then, Cyril gives a reason as to why the blind man did not inquire about the identity of his healer. He explains that those not beguiled by poverty (τῆς ἀγοητεύτου πενίας) do not understand how it is to struggle with untempered need (ἀκράτῳ μαχομένοις ἐνδείᾳ) that makes the afflicted person not interested in making acquaintances (γνῶσιν).[70] This comment betrays sentiments of empathy that arise either with a sensitive soul or with a man who experienced poverty. Cyril, most probably, understood quite well what poverty meant during his stay in the desert being surrounded with monks who hardly owned anything.

Cyril also comments on Jn 12:4–8 where Judas is complaining about the waste of ointment poured by Mary on Christ's feet instead of giving the money to the poor. Cyril wrote that the only thing that should precede the love for the poor (ἡ φιλοπτωχία) is the veneration of God. It is not possible to constantly put all our time and effort into the priestly service (τὴν ἱερατικὴν λειτουργίαν); rather, we should give time to the poor. Cyril gives precedence to serving the poor over priestly service.[71] This could arise

---

[69] A detailed account of his scriptural exegetical writings will be discussed in the section "The Date of the Commentary of the Gospel of John."

[70] Cyril of Alexandria, *Sancti Patris Nostri Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium. Accedunt Fragmenta varia necnon Tractatus Ad Tierium Diaconum Duo*, Edited by P. E. Pussey, vol. 2 (Bruxelles: Impression Anastaltique Culture et Civilisation, 1965), 161. Will later be referred to *In Jo.*

[71] *In. Jo.* 2.303.

from two points; first, his deep concern for and understanding of the plight of the poor; second, because at the time he wrote *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* he is not yet affiliated to the priesthood.[72]

One aspect of the monastic wisdom holds that silence is more profitable than words. Cyril's experience of silence appears in his writings.[73] He writes on Jn 6:25 "When they found him on the other side of the sea, they said to him, "Rabbi, when did you come here?" that the question is of no purpose for the people learned nothing of it. Cyril remarks that there was no need for the question since He was already there. If they had observed his presence in silence, they would have learned more. Cyril writes, "Therefore, we seek wisdom from the wise, and let us honor silence in trembling above uneducated words." (σοφὰ τοιγαροῦν παρὰ σοφῶν ζητητέον, καὶ προτετιμήσθω λόγων ἀπαιδεύτων ἡ ἐν συνέσει σιγή.)[74] In Hellenistic culture, a person who asks an unwise question is understood to be an uneducated person (ἀπαιδεύτων) and lacks wisdom and logical thinking.

Cyril considers the dogmatic interpretation of his works, including that of the Gospel of John, as part of a spiritual undertaking that every believer needs to have. He is most probably influenced by the Pauline verse, "And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love," (1 Cor 13:13) that explains the three dimensional side of human spirituality. These three aspects need to be nourished in order for a person to reach a spiritual goal, that is, to be in the presence of God in the Divine Courts. Cyril writes:

> There are three things we need to attend to with which we can attain the divine courts and ascend to the church of the firstborn. Namely by practices of various aspects of

[72] The commentary does not reveal any special attention to the role of the priesthood. This is very clear in the exposition of Jn 6:48–56 (Bk 4 ch.2 in the commentary) where the pericope deals with the Bread from heaven. This is a direct reference to the Eucharist, yet Cyril addressed the verses through a dogmatic approach. It is true that the whole commentary is dogmatic; thus, this approach is no surprise at this pericope, however, the focus on the bread as a vivifying body and understood through the lens of the Incarnation without any reference to the priesthood can assert the idea that Cyril was not yet affiliated to the priesthood. This is one of the internal pieces of evidence that advocates the composition of the commentary before his episcopal career.

[73] Silence as a means of teaching can be more understood from the story of Abba Joseph in the section of "Important Figures Residing in the Nitrean Desert at the Time of Cyril."

[74] *In Jo.* 1.434.

> righteousness, by faith in orthodox doctrines, by hope in [eternal] life. Therefore, there is no other than a protector who would be capable to lead us in such things, a true cause rather than a mere excuse, except our Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed not."[75]

Working on some "aspects of righteousness" is nothing but doing good deeds, which would be void if not within the realm of divine neighborly love. "Faith in orthodox doctrines" is essential, not mere faith but it must be orthodox or we would be in the list of heretics mentioned in the first chapter of Cyril's Johannine commentary. Finally, without hope in the eternal life, we would fall into despair and never reach our goal, the divine courts. It is clear, Cyril is undertaking his dogmatic commentary from a spiritual point of view, where he considers discussion of dogmatic matters as part of our three fold spirituality or else we fail to attain the divine courts.

These are just a few examples of the spirituality present in the writings of Cyril. Though his works are primarily exegetical and dogmatic, the spirituality of the Desert is intertwined in every page of his writings. He truly considered every exegetical and dogmatic work as a spiritual undertaking.

The Important Figures Residing in the Nitrian Desert at the Time of Cyril

The desert trained Cyril to read and apply Scripture together with spiritual and ascetic exercises. Another aspect of the monastic training that Cyril experienced in the desert was discipleship. This is an important aspect of the monastic life and it greatly influenced the church's ideal of what a teacher (διδάσκαλος) should be, and shows what was expected of church leadership. Discipleship in the Nitrian Desert began with the model of a father and sons. The system began with an anchorite who attained great fame for his pious life and spiritual wisdom. The means of obtaining the wisdom of the desert varied according to the circumstance and personalities of the inhabitants of the desert. In the course of time, this wise anchorite or hermit began to gain renown through some stories propagated orally by desert visitors about the monk's spiritual status. Soon men came to seek his

---

[75] Διὰ τριῶν τοιγαροῦν πραγμάτων ταῖς ἄνω καὶ θείαις προσβαλοῦμεν αὐλαῖς, καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν πρωτοτόκων ἀναβησόμεθα ἐκκλησίαν· διὰ πράξεως δή φημι, τῆς κατὰ ποικίλην ἀρετὴν, καὶ πίστεως τῆς ἐν ὀρθότητι, καὶ ἐλπίδος τῆς ἐν ζωῇ. ἆρ᾽ οὖν ἕτερος ἡμῖν τοῦ δύνασθαι τοιαῦτα δρᾶν γενήσεται χορηγὸς, ἢ πρόξενος, ἢ αἰτία, ἢ πρόφασις παρὰ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν; οὐμενοῦν· *In Jo.* 2.409

advice and discipleship. The number of disciples varied from one monk to another according to his own personal capacity,[76] but, no matter how many disciples the father accepted, there were always one or two very special disciples who accompanied the father throughout his life. An example of this can be found in Paphnotius and John, the two disciples of St. Macarius the Great.[77] When the disciples grew in number, the father would appoint some of his disciples who attained spiritual maturity to oversee the new comers. The growing numbers of disciples seeking guidance from a desert father gradually led to weakness of spiritual guidance and this led occasionally to the weakness of the desert spirituality. Nonetheless, those disciples who showed the greatest obedience to their spiritual father were the ones who benefited most from his teachings.[78]

Through the Nitrean system of father-disciple relationship monastic teachings were propagated. The system was not based on a rivalry of who attained more disciples nor did it ever involve the idea that the disciples should not seek other fathers in the desert for sayings of wisdom. Loyalty to a father was not threatened by seeking wisdom from as many hermits as possible. Seeking words of wisdom was encouraged by many for it was never considered as a threat of obedience to the father to whom the disciple entrusted his salvation. This system made it possible to orally transmit the *sayings* of as many fathers as one could consult.

When we apply this monastic model of discipleship to the case of Cyril we can propose the following image. Cyril remained for five years in the desert and left in the year 400, at the age of twenty-two, for Alexandria after being summoned by his uncle Theophilus. Therefore, the major fathers residing in the desert during the last decade or two before the end of the

---

[76] We have Mark the obedient disciple of Silvanus, the most beloved of the twelve disciples. In comparison we know of Abba Moses the Black who had seventy disciples or Isaac, one of the disciples of St. Macarius the Great who had one hundred and fifty disciples. We also know of Abba Isidorus who had a thousand disciples. The one who exceeded all is Serapion, bishop of Oxyrhynchus who had ten thousand brothers and twenty thousand sisters. Matta-El-Meskeen, 337. The development of communities through the charisma of a spiritual leader could best be seen through the life of St. Pachomius. Armand Veilleux, trans., *Pachomian Koinonia*. Vol.1, *The Life of Saint Pachomius* (Klamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1980.). For a more detailed study about discipleship refer to Irénée Hausherr, *Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East*, trans. Anthony P. Gythiel (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1990.)

[77] Matta-El-Meskeen, 337.

[78] Ibid., 338.

fifth century would be those who had the most impact on Cyril. Of those, other than Serapion the Wise, we have St. Macarius the Great and Abba Joseph. There were other significant figures dwelling in the desert at that time who most probably impacted Cyril, but to investigate every figure in that era would be beyond the scope of this study. The idea is to give an example of how the presence of these colossal figures in the desert could affect the formulation of the image of the teacher-disciple relationship together with other monastic virtues that formed the Christian ideal for Cyril.

St. Macarius was a close friend of Serapion the Wise. Serapion wrote his biography and they both shared the discipleship of St. Antony the Great. Most probably Cyril had a personal interaction with St. Macarius, heard about him from his father Serapion, attended the talks that he addressed to the monks, and also participated in the propagation of the oral tradition of Macarius in the desert during and after the latter's lifetime. Macarius died around the year 397. He gave a farewell speech that, according to the biography of Serapion the Wise, was attended by all the monks of Nitrea.[79] There is a great probability that Cyril witnessed this event, which must have taught him a great lesson in discipleship. The image of the great Macarius surrounded by all the monks in the Nitrean desert standing silently to hear every word uttered by the father of the desert must have given him a new vision and understanding of the impact of a teacher on his disciples.

The second figure is that of Abba Joseph,[80] who died in 407. He was another disciple of St. Antony and St. Macarius. It is because of his affiliation to these two great saints that we think he maintained close friendship with Serapion the Wise, who shared the same discipleship with St. Antony and friendship with St. Macarius. Cyril must have witnessed the following story about the father's role in the spiritual salvation of his disciples unfolding in the desert. It is narrated that Abba Joseph was overcome with an overwhelming sadness unlike anything ever known to him. He always remained silent whenever asked about his deep sorrow. However, one day his disciples could not tolerate his sorrow any longer and

---

[79] The text of the full speech is found in Matta-El-Meskeen p111–118.

[80] He is not the Joseph of Panephysis that received Cassian when he first arrived in Tannis as mentioned in Cassian's *Conferences XI-XVII* and *XIX-XXIV*. A sample of his sayings can be found in Benedicta Ward, trans., *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection* (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1984), 101–104. Nor is he the Joseph who was one of the seven brother monks in the Nitrean Desert.

fell at his feet entreating him to tell them the reason of his grief and silence. Although he kept his silence, they understood that it must be something related to their behavior that depressed their father so greatly. At last, Abba Joseph said that he was troubled with himself because he saw himself, together with all the brothers in the desert, regressing in their spiritual life. He noted that he felt he was loosing his spiritual life, together with that of his disciples. He elaborated that there was not enough fear of God. He also went on to explain that when the fathers used to meet they discussed things that elevated each of them to the kingdom of heaven, but now when there is talk among the brethren, it pulls them down to the lowest level. The spiritual life among the disciples of Abba Joseph became so bad that Abba Silvaus and Abba Lot decided to leave the Nitrean desert because the brethren no longer cared about the monastic rules of the elders. Talk in the desert did not enrich their souls any longer but became obstructive to their biblical reading and daily prayers. Abba Joseph concluded with the following ultimatum: they would either repent by following the monastic rules of the elders or he would leave the desert like the rest of the pious fathers.

This was a catalyst of sort for the brothers. They began entreating him to stay among them, explaining that their negligent life was caused by the lack of instruction from the elders and that the saints did not sit among them and talk about the lives of the fathers and their way of life. They were deprived of direction from the elders. When Abba Joseph saw how each of the brothers was moved he began calming the situation, he asked them to stand, and raise their hands in prayer. Their lengthy prayer was accompanied with great remorse and repentance. At the conclusion of the psalmody, Abba Joseph asked the brothers to be strong and resume their love for each other and keep the rules of the fathers and he, Abba Joseph, would be their guarantee before the heavenly Father that they would all be in the kingdom of heaven. Abba Joseph sent word to the fathers who left Nitrea to return back and the spirituality of the Nitrean desert was revived.[81] This is a powerful story of a single father who was able to revive the laxity that overcame the brethren of a whole community in the desert. The events of this story occurred during Cyril's stay in the desert. The story of such a community and the powerful message of the role of the father/teacher to change the lives of the whole community surely impacted Cyril's understanding of the power of teaching, for the lack of teaching by the elders led to ignorance of the spiritual way of life among the monks.

[81] Matta-El-Meskeen, 296–299.

Cyril understood the impact of teaching upon every aspect of the church, whether on the monastic level or on the level of the average believer. He understood the role of a teacher from St. Macarius, Serapion the Wise, Abba Joseph, and others who exemplified the system of monastic discipleship.

If Cyril remained any longer in the desert, he might have been one of the ascetic fathers who gathered disciples of his own; however, his short stay made him know the essence of the lives of these great fathers and put it to work throughout his episcopal career. He always kept in touch with the desert, but he was never to be identified as part of it.

As previously mentioned, we do not have any detailed account of the early life of Cyril. Nevertheless, based on the scant data that we know about him we can propose this plausible account of Cyril's stay and training in the "desert."

Cyril and the Position of Reader ἀναγνώστης

Our interest in the rank of ἀναγνώστης, reader or lector, arose from a passing remark in the *History of the Patriarchs* by Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunein, stating that "Cyril was the attendant of Theophilus in the patriarchal cell" and he was also an "ἀναγνώστης."[82] Three centuries earlier, around A.D. 690, John, Coptic Bishop of Nikiu, wrote about Cyril's early childhood, "they shaved his head and numbered him amongst the readers and appointed him to be an *anagnostes*."[83] Severus' account appears not dependent on John of Nikiu's account because he omits John's reference to Cyril being ordained deacon at a later time. With regard to Cyril's story, this suggests that Severus had one or more independent sources, the majority of which did not mention Cyril being a deacon; thus, Severus was accurate in his analysis of his sources and did not add the deaconal ordination to his story. After the death of Theophilus, there were two candidates to the See of Saint Mark, an archdeacon by the name of Timothy and Cyril. Historians attribute the title "archdeacon" to Timothy, while no account attaches a title to Cyril's name.[84] This gives a general consensus among early historians that Cyril did not have any clerical rank before becoming the Bishop of Alexandria.

Cyril accompanied his uncle Theophilus to the Synod of the Oaks in 403. If he accompanied Theophilus in the capacity of an attendant, he

[82] *Patrologia Orientalis* 1.428.
[83] Charles, 76.
[84] Socrates *HE* 2.156.

would not have had the right to attend the sessions of the synod as Cyril himself attested.[85] It is in his capacity of being an ἀναγνώστης that he was able to witness the proceedings of the synod.[86] If Cyril was appointed to the rank of ἀναγνώστης after learning his scriptures during his stay in the desert, then this would have been at the age of twenty-two. Thus he was a reader for twelve years or more before he became a bishop in A.D. 412. It was during this period that Cyril began writing his voluminous exegetical works. Therefore, a careful examination of the rank of ἀναγνώστης is worth pursuing.

Since the position of the reader was not considered part of the clerical ranks, not much attention was paid to this rank, and sources that referenced to the reader's rank are extremely scarce. Another problem that faces the researcher is that this scanty information is collected from divergent places and different periods. Not all churches followed the same ordination rites or delegated the same responsibilities to the reader's rank. Thus, this research will focus only upon the resources that might be relevant to the Church of Alexandria. Furthermore, relevancy is based on consistency and continuity.

The practice of reading aloud was common in the days when illiteracy was dominant throughout society. In addition, it was a suitable form of communal participation in the liturgical readings. Therefore, the church, from its infancy, adopted the practice of reading aloud in the congregation. The writings of the New Testament attest to this practice. In Col. 4:16, "And when this letter has been read among you, have it read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and see that you read the letter from Laodicea." In 2 Thess. 5: 27, "I adjure you by the Lord that this letter be read to all the brethren." In Rev. 1:3, "Blessed is he who reads aloud the words of the prophecy…." These scriptural verses do not make it clear whether this

---

[85] *ACO* 1.1.7 p148, 31–36. *PG* 77.157. CPG 5333.

[86] Russell, McGuckin, and Abel mentioned Cyril to be a lector and have accepted this title for Cyril as a matter of fact. McGuckin and Abel stated that Cyril was appointed lector in 403. They both accepted that Cyril accompanied his uncle Theophilus to the Synod in 403 in the capacity of an ἀναγνώστης and suggested the date of the Synod to be the date of his ordination. John McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology, and Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 5. F. M. Abel, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la Palestine," 230. While Russell states that "he would have been at least a lector and perhaps also a secretary to his uncle, as Theophilus had been to Athanasius" without giving a date. Russell, 6.

injunction of reading aloud in the church was assigned to one specific person or simply to someone who had the ability to read.

The first mention of a "reader" is in the writings of Justin Martyr (*c.*100–*c.* 165). In his *First Apology* he exhorts the faithful as follows, "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place,[87] and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things."[88] Therefore, by the middle of the second century, the practice of reading the Epistles and parts of Old Testament seems to be established as part of the Christian worship. The reading is followed by a sermon that is conducted by "the president" not the reader. There is no clear indication that the "reader" is either a person dedicated to such work or is part of the clerical hierarchy.

Tertullian (*c.* 160–*c.* 225) reflects in *On Prescription Against Heretics* that the reader is a rank in the church. He writes, "And so it comes to pass that to-day one man is their bishop, to-morrow another; to-day he is a deacon who to-morrow is a reader; to-day he is a presbyter who to-morrow is a layman."[89] By the end of the second or beginning of the third century the "reader" was established as a rank in the church but clearly one that is of lower rank than that of a deacon.

A few decades later, in A.D. 250, we read in the Epistles of Cyrian (*d.* 258) of a great development in the rank of "reader." In Epistle 23, Cyprian writes to the clergy about appointing a certain Saturus as reader. Cyprian justifies his appointment on the grounds that the clergy previously entrusted Saturus with the Easter readings. Cyprian also speaks about appointing a certain Optatus "from among the readers to be a teacher of the hearers; examining first of all, whether all things were found in such as were in preparation for the clerical office."[90] Thus, by the middle of the third century, the appointment of readers became the prerogative of the bishop.

---

[87] The gathering might not necessarily be in a church.

[88] Justin Martyr *Apologia I pro christianus* 67. Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγυμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχωπεῖ. εἶτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προεστώς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. A. W. F. Blunt, ed. *The Apology of Justin Martyr* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1911), 100. ANF 1.186.

[89] Tertullian *de praescriptione haereticorum* 61. CSEL 70. ANF 3: 263.

[90] Cyprian *Epistles* 23. CSEL 3.536.

This appointment should include some consultation with the clergy for which Cyprian is defending his action for not doing on the basis that the clergy have already shown no objection for Saturus to read on previous occasions. It is important to note that not all readers were of the same rank. Optatus was assigned to be a "teacher." This position of "reader" and "teacher" seem to be "in preparation for the clerical office."[91] Therefore, the rank of the reader-teacher in the church was not considered part of the clerical hierarchy, though he was eligible for teaching. This specific rank of reader-teacher survived until the twelfth century Byzantium. The title διδασκάλος was assigned to the "Gospel exegete." This exegete and διδασκάλος would be in the "Great Church" under the jurisdiction of the patriarch.[92] The continuity of this tradition from the third century church of Cyprian in Carthage to the twelfth century Byzantium, indicated the great possibility of it being the case with Cyril in Alexandria at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century. As noted above, not all readers were teachers. Nonetheless, Cyril was a reader in the patriarchal residence, who was sent to the desert to study scripture, was under the discipleship of Theophilus, was groomed to succeed his uncle, accompanied Theophilus to the Synod of the Oaks, and was most certainly a reader in the rank of διδασκάλος. In fact he was assigned to be a "Gospel exegete."

Cyprian's thirty-second Epistle speaks about another appointment of a certain Aurelius as reader. Aurelius was chosen to the rank of "reader" on the basis of his merit. His faith was tested and he proved victorious because he confessed twice, he was tortured, exiled, and did not renounce his faith. His body revealed the scars of his wounds and his modesty were exemplary to the whole congregation.[93] Although Cyprian refers to him as a reader, his

---

[91] Lampe cites Canon 10 of the Concilium Sardicense in A.D. 343 that states that the "bishop must first have been reader, deacon and priest." G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1994), 99. We are not sure to what extent this cannon was put into practice and how many churches, other than that of Sardinia, have abided by it. However, there is another tradition, in the Church of Alexandria, that if the person nominated to the rank of bishop is not a priest, he would receive the rank of priesthood the day before his ordination to the episcopal rank. This tradition is kept up to the present day in the Church of Alexandria.

[92] J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'Église Byzantine de l'Orient Chrétien 11* (Paris: Institute Français d'Études Byzantines, 1970), 75.

[93] The Synod of Carthage decreed that "When a reader is ordained, the bishop makes a discourse to the people upon him, his faith and his life, and then delivers to him the codex from which he is to read…." Charles J. A. Hefele, *A History of the*

merits would have promoted him to "a higher degree of clerical ordination."[94] Readers were not nominated on the sole basis of their reading ability, but, in addition, they were nominated for their virtue and their orthodox faith. This is further demonstrated in Epistle 33 where Cyprian writes about appointing Celerinus as reader. His merits as a confessor promoted him to the reader's rank. Cyprian writes, "There is nothing in which a confessor can do more good to the brethren than that, while the reading of the Gospel is heard from his lips, every one who hears should imitate the faith of the reader."[95] Due to the fact that Cyprian chose two exemplary people to the reader's rank, he thinks that "they may be honoured with the same presents as the presbyters, and may share the monthly divisions in equalled quantities."[96] The *Apostolic Constitution* provided similar provisions for the reader's rank since they can receive alms.[97]

Every ecclesiastical promotion is accompanied by a rite, though not all rites are of equal significance.[98] The earliest available reference to the rite of appointing an ἀναγνώστης is in the *Règlement ecclésiastique égyptien* where the bishop keeps the prerogative of appointing the ἀναγνώστης.[99] A prayer accompanies this appointment but the rite is clear to emphasize that there is no imposition of hands.[100] In contrast to the previous rites, the *Apostolic Constitutions* do provide a prayer that makes the imposition of hands very clear. The Constitution belongs to Matthew the Apostle and it states,

> Ordain a reader by laying your hands upon him, and pray unto God, and say: O Eternal God, who is plenteous in mercy and compassions, who has made manifest the constitution of the

---

Councils of the Church, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1883), 411. Therefore, Cyprian on this occasion was following the decrees of his church.

[94] Cyprian *Epistles* 32. CSEL 3.565.

[95] Ibid., *Epistles.* 33. CSEL 3.571.

[96] Ibid.

[97] "Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστης ἐστὶ λαμβανέτω καὶ αὐτὸς μοῖραν μίαν εἰς τιμὴν τῶν προφητῶν ὡ σαύτως κρὶ ψαλμῳδὸς καὶ πυλωρός. S'il y a un lecteur, il recevra une part de sportule, en l'honneur des prophètes, de même le chantre et le portier." The *Constitutions Apostoliques* quoted in H. Leclercq, "Lecteur," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (1929), 2243.

[98] Darrouzès, 15.

[99] Darrouzès points out that all ranks and clerical orders are delegated by the bishop, *ex cathedra*. Darrouzès, 67.

[100] *Règlement ecclèsiastique ègyptien* quoted in Leclercq, 2246. The *Canons of Hippolytus* do emphasize that there is no imposition of hands in the appointment rite. Ibid., 2247.

> world by your operations, and keeps the number of your elect, do also guard carefully your servant, who is to be entrusted to read your Holy Scripture, and your law and give him the Holy Spirit, the prophetic Spirit. You who instructed the wise Esdras your servant to read your laws to the people, and now call on your servant and grant him wisdom to accomplish without blame the work entrusted to him and be worthy to receive a higher degree, through Christ, with whom glory and worship be to you and to the Holy Spirit for ever. Amen.[101]

The *Apostolic Constitutions* is preserved in Coptic[102] and therefore was known in Egypt at the time of Cyril, yet there is no indication from the description given to Cyril that the reader's rank is affiliated to the clerical hierarchy. In addition, John, Bishop of Nikiu, a few centuries later wrote that Cyril was tonsured and does not mention imposition of hands.[103] John, being a bishop, is surely aware of all the rites of the church since he administers them himself and could not have missed the point of not mentioning the laying of hands. Thus, we can conclude, that up until the tenth century in the Church of Alexandria, the ἀναγνώστης was tonsured without the imposition of hands.[104] The present rite for appointing an

---

[101] *Constitutiorum Apostolicarum* VII.22. ὁ ποτὲ τελώνης διατάσσομαι ἀναγνώστην ἐπιχείρισαι ἐπιθεὶς αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ ἐπευξάμενος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λέγε, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος, ὁ πολὺς ἐν ἐλέει καὶ οἰκτιρμοις, ὁ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν διὰ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων φανεροποιήσας καὶ τὸν ἀπιθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σοῦ διαφυλαττων αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν ἔπιδε ἐπι τὸν δοῦλόν σου γραφὰς ἀναγινώσκειν τῷ λαῷ σου καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα προφιτικόν. ὁ σοφίσας Ἔσδραν τὸν θεράποντά σου ἐπι τὸ ἀναγινώσκειν τοὺς νόμους σου τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ νῦν παρακαλούμενος ὑφ ἡμῶν σόφισον τὸν σοῦλόν σου καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ, ἔργον ἀκατάγνωστον διανύσαντα τὸ ἐγχειρισθέν αὐτῷ ἄξιον ἀναδειχθῆναι μείζονος βαθμοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ μεθ οὗ σοι ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ σέβας καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰωνας. ἀμήν. C. C. J. Bunsen, ed. *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*, vol II (London: Longman, Brown, Green, et Longmans, 1854), 428.

[102] Ibid.

[103] Charles, 76.

[104]Darrouzès clarified some of the ambiguities related to the rites of ordination due to the different usage of terms in different places through the centuries. He says that, in general, by eleventh and twelfth century Byzantium, these terms χειροτονία, σφραγίς, and προβολή were used to indicate the following: Χειροτονία: designates an ordination by election and imposition of hands and is reserved for the ordination of bishop, chorbishop, priest, deacon, and sub-deacon. Σφραγίς: is the sign of the cross and is reserved to the chanters, readers, archons, and others. Προβολή: is a promotion and is assigned to the econome and others. Darrouzès, 89. For further elaboration on the problem facing the canonists

ἀναγνώστης in the Church of Alexandria is by a tonsure of five crosses, one in the middle and four on the side accompanied by the invocation of the Holy Trinity without the imposition of hands.[105]

The age of appointing an ἀναγνώστης varied considerably. In the time of Cyprian, the reader's appointment was as a quite mature man who survived persecution and resisted renouncing the faith under the penalty of death. It seems that after the peace of the church, children were appointed readers. Leclercq found two records of an ἀναγνώστης at the age of five. In fact, the range was from age five to seventy-three. Records indicate that teenagers together with men in their early and mid twenties were the most frequently appointed.[106] As we previously suggested, Cyril was summoned from the desert after the eruption of the Origenist controversy at the age of twenty-two. It is not clear from Severus' account when Cyril was an ἀναγνώστης. Moreover, it is not known whether he went to the desert after being appointed ἀναγνώστης and whether his schooling in the desert was to fulfil the requirement of knowledge of scripture—as is expected of those in the rank—or whether he was sent in preparation for the rank and on his return to Alexandria he was promoted to be an ἀναγνώστης. It is most probable that Theophilus sent him to the desert first to be taught by the great desert teachers and on his return when he proved to be of great potential, his uncle made him an ἀναγνώστης and furthered his study in rhetoric in anticipation of the position he expected to fulfill later in life.

The job description of a reader entailed many activities. Their education must have put them in a position of distinction even before the appointment. Their nomination based on their integrity must have further enhanced their prestige in society. Therefore, an ἀναγνώστης had both secular and religious responsibilities and activities and, most probably, was expected to be capable of fulfilling these duties.

The secular activities of the reader come from the advantage of literacy that he possessed. A fourth century papyrus from Oxyrhynchus is written

---

concerning further distinctions between the terms χειροτονία and σφραγίς read Darrouzès, 90–1. Darrouzès clarifies that a seventeenth century *Euchologion* mentions that the ἀναγνώστης receives two types of σφραγίς, a tonsure in the sign of the cross and three signs of the cross. Darrouzès, 151. Hans-Georg Beck provides a general study about the clergy and laity in Byzantium in his work *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 79–94.

[105] *The Order of the Fraction of the Priesthood and Consecrating the Altar Vessels*, (Diocese of Beni Suef and Bahnasa, 1992), 13.

[106] Leclercq, 2247.

by "Aurelius Ammonius, son of Corperus, lector of the former church of the village of Chysis"[107] during the Diocletian persecution in Egypt. He informs "the consulship of our lords the emperors Diocletian … and Maximian…"[108] that the church delivered the bronze door that was its only possession. The presence of a literate man, at least in Greek, in a small church in a village such as Chysis put him in a position to serve the church in more ways than reading scripture and instructing the faithful. This is one of the rare documents that illustrate an activity outside the liturgical setting. It is obvious that readers must have conducted other church business that needed literary skills if no other literate person was present in the congregation. The reader was selected for his integrity and was, thus, trustworthy to speak, in many cases, on behalf of the church in legal affairs even if there were other literate believers at hand. Therefore, it is very possible that Cyril was entrusted with other clerical affairs in the Patriarchate. This is proven by his presence at the Synod of the Oaks as a secretary where he oversaw some of the clerical duties of the Synod.

Religious responsibilities of the reader, as we previously said, were not limited to the liturgical readings. The reader-teacher had to instruct the believers after the liturgy. This practice persisted in Egypt at least until the tenth century. Believers were exhorted to spend their Sundays reading the word of God. The faithful were advised to seek readers to the greatest extent. If they did not have a reader in their village, they traveled to another village and spent the Sunday there. As for the readers themselves, they were rewarded by a great grace and blessing when they spent Sundays reading to the believers.[109]

Nevertheless, their position as teachers in the church contained its boundaries. They were not to deliver sermons in churches. Sermon delivery was always reserved for the Bishop and to anyone the bishop delegated. This delegation was given primarily to priests, and only to priests with special abilities to preach. As in the case of John Chrysostom it was a great privilege for him, as a priest, to deliver sermons in the presence of his bishop. In the case where readers had the potential to preach, they were ordained as priests to give them the privilege to preach.[110] In many cases,

---

[107] P.Oxy. XXXIII 2673. Peter Parson, ed. and trans., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 33, (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1968), 107.

[108] Ibid.

[109] Severus Bishop of El-Ashmunien, *El-Dur El-Thamin fi Edah El-Din* (Cairo, Egypt: The New Bookstore, 1925), 197–8.

[110] Cyprian in *Epistle* 33 informs the church that he is selecting Celerinus and Aurelius to be readers. He writes "Know, then, that these for the present are

when a learned person had the right to teach and thus had the title διδάσκαλος he would put his abilities in writing. This was the case of Origen,[111] Didymus the Blind, and Ephrem the Syrian, where not one of them was part of the clergy but their position as a διδάσκαλος in the church permitted them to produce numerous writings.[112] It is worthwhile noting that most of their literary production was devoted to exegetical works.

Cyril considered himself a διδάσκαλος and his spiritual understanding of the talent entrusted to him, was obviously the motivating factor for his writing and putting on paper what would benefit the church and her believers. He repeatedly spoke about teaching used in the service of "divine teaching" (τῶν θείων μαθημάτων)[113] and how the teacher had to be patient with his listeners and not get weary of repetition. On another occasion he writes about the fruit of teaching (τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ... καρπόν) noting that a good teacher should not grow weary of repetition (ἐπαναλήψεως) nor bury the Master's talent in the earth (καθάπερ εἰς γῆν, τὸ δεσποτεικὸν ἀντορύττειν τάλαντον) but must trade the money on the table and the Savior would recover that money from the tables and give it life.[114] Cyril felt that he was entrusted with knowledge and given the gift of teaching and had an obligation to use his talent by spreading the seed which the Lord will

---

appointed readers, because it was fitting that the candle should be placed in a candlestick, whence it may give light to all, and that their glorious countenance should be established in a higher place, where, behold by all the surrounding brotherhood, they may give an incitement of glory to the beholders. But know that I have already proposed the honour of the presbytery for them…." *Ep.* 33. In many cases, the reader's rank was the first step towards the priesthood. Many were never selected to the priesthood, as we see in the case of readers at the age of seventy-three, for reasons that are never disclosed. So if a reader had the potential of preaching, he would be ordained to the priesthood.

[111] Origen began to deliver sermons only after his ordination to the priesthood in Ceasarea. All of his literary activity in Alexandria were scholarly theological treatises and exegetical writings, none of which are in homiletic form.

[112] It should be noted that priestly and episcopal positions were not the license for any of these men to write. We have the example of St. Athanasius who wrote two of his masterpieces before he became a bishop. He wrote *Oratio contra gentes* and *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi* in A.D. 318 at the age of twenty-two and a decade before becoming bishop of Alexandria and before his ordination as deacon in A.D. 319. I did not include him among the above mentioned list because these two writings are not exegetical.

[113] *In Jo.* 1.271.

[114] Ibid., 1.192.

use to give life to the listeners. On another occasion, Cyril writes the following:

> …[He] wasted long discourses on those who came to Him, therefore, giving us a most beautiful example, setting Himself a model to the church teachers to imitate. For even though not all might attain profit on account of their own depravity, yet since some have likely made use of the good, thereby, we must not hesitate to lead to what is profitable. For, as it were, we bury in unfruitful silence the talent given to us, that is, the grace through the spirit, we shall be like the wicked servant who said to his master without restraint, "I know that you are a harsh man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you did not scatter seed and I was afraid and withheld your talent in the earth, here you have what is yours."
> ...διεκαρτέρει μακροὺς ἀναλίσκων λόγους τοῖς προσιοῦσιν αὐτῷ κάλλιστον ἡμῖν ὑπογραμμὸν καὶ διὰ τούτων διδοὺς καὶ τύπον ἑαυτὸν τοῖς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλοις ἀνατιθεις. εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ πάντες ὠφελοῖτο τυχὸν ἕνεκά γε τῆς σφῶν αὐτῶν μοχθηρίας, ἀλλ' ἐπείπερ εἰκὸς ἀπόνασθαί τινας τῆς ἐντεῦθεν σπουδῆς, οὐκ ὀκνητέον περὶ τὴν τῶν συμφερόντων ὑφήγησιν. καταχωννῦντες γὰρ ὥσπερ εἰς ἄκαρπον σιωπὴν τὸ δοθὲν ἡμῖν τάλαντον, τουτέστι, τὴν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἐσόμεθα τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκέτην τὸν ἀνέδην λέγοντα τῷ οἰκείῳ δεσπότῃ "Ηιδειν ὅτι σκληρὸς ἄνθρωπος εἶ, θερίζων ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρας, καὶ συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας, καὶ φοβηθεὶς κατέχωσα τὸ τάλαντόν σου. ἴδε ἔχεις τὸ σόν.[115]

Cyril regarded the knowledge that he acquired a talent that he could not bury lest the Master of the house might come and take it away from him. He felt the spiritual obligation to teach, or spread his teaching on the tables, and expected the Lord to give life to his words and reap the fruit of his toil. This is a recurring theme in Cyril's writing.

Some of the readers expected a promotion in their status. For some, being made a reader was the first step to ecclesiastical posts. Those who were satisfied with the priesthood without aspiring to the higher episcopal ranks were encouraged to get married at the age of puberty. A Synod at Hippo in A.D. 393 decreed that "When the readers have attained the age of puberty, they must either marry or make a vow of continence."[116] There were restrictions on the wife to be. If she was a widow, then the reader was aware that his highest rank of promotion was subdeacon.[117] Readers were

---

[115] *In Jo.* 2.55,56.
[116] Hefele, 398.
[117] Ibid., 419.

not to marry heretical women, permit their children to be married to heretics, or allow their children to be baptized by heretics.[118] Those who took the vow of celibacy had to make this decision at a young age. Therefore, we can conclude that Cyril took the vow of celibacy at a young age and this decision settled the prospects of Cyril. He was not to be a lay priest serving in a parish, but rather had the possibility of promotion to the episcopal rank.[119]

The primary and secondary education of Cyril

Recent excavations in Egypt and in the northern territories of the Roman Empire have shown "that Egypt was not isolated in its writing practices."[120] In addition, Egypt was a good representative of the educational system around the Mediterranean region. The papyri evidence gathered from Egypt agrees with the information gathered from Plutarch, the second century Greek philosopher, and with Libanius, the fourth century Syrian rhetorician, and Quintilian, the first century Roman rhetor.[121] Furthermore, excavations in Egypt provided writing boards from the fourth and fifth century A.D. with arithmetic exercises which archeologists are sure belong to primary school children.[122] Upon further comparison with other exercise boards in Greek education it was concluded that the Greek and Coptic language curriculum coincided. Marrou writes,

> …when one compares the school manual dating from the end of the third century B.C. that has been edited by Guéraud and Jouguet with any of the Coptic schoolbooks of the fourth century A.D., one is struck by the extraordinary similarity of the methods employed: with more than five centuries between them, the procedure is the same in both cases."[123]

Browning in his most recent study confirmed Marrou's results. Browning writes,

> …change on the whole had been slow and almost imperceptible. Traditional attitudes, methods and values had sunk deep roots in

[118] Ibid., vol 3, 400.

[119] A general summary of readers and their duties could be found in Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 218–231.

[120] Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind, Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 6.

[121] Ibid.

[122] H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, translated by G. Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 158.

[123] Ibid., 154.

> ancient society, roots which remained relatively undisturbed by the social, political and religious changes of the period. Education of all kinds was marked by rigid conservatism. There was no resistance to innovation because there was no innovation to resist."[124]

Kaster reached similar conclusions when he wrote that "the commonly observed truth that the late-antique schools of grammar and rhetoric were sound proof against the outside world, their methods and their status largely untouched by the profound political and religious changes that had taken place around them."[125] Based on these findings, together with the recently published corpus of three hundred and thirty-two Coptic school texts, we can conclude that the Hellenistic educational system is applicable to Egyptian curriculums whether in Greek or Coptic. Actually, Cribiore frequently discussed through her study how bilingualism affected the young student's education. In Egypt, students spoke Coptic at home and functioned "in their daily life in Greek *koine*, but were exposed to literary Attic Greek in school."[126] Browning writes that "Coptic-speaking students were often expected to learn a little Greek. So we find them copying lists of Greek words with their Coptic equivalents, *sententiae* of Menander with interlinear Coptic translations, and short scriptural texts in both languages." Browning also asserts that archeological data affirm this system to have held until the seventh-century in Upper Egypt.[127]

Thus, our information about Hellenistic education will be relevant to the education that Cyril received in his childhood.

Hellenistic education was divided into three periods, each consisting of seven years. The first period was that of a "small child" (παιδίον) and continued to the age of seven. The second phase, that of the "child" (παῖς) was from the age of seven to that of fourteen. The third educational phase was that of an "adolescent" (μειράκιον) and that lasted until the age of twenty-one years old.[128] The last phase did not necessarily continue for seven years since—as we shall soon see—some of this curriculum was moved to the earlier phase by grammarians. In practice, "the boundaries

---

[124] Robert Browning, *Education in the Roman Empire*, The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. Avril Cameron, vol. 14 (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 855.

[125] Robert Kaster, *Guardians of Language, the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), ix. Browning comments that "such general statements call for some qualification." Browning, 855.

[126] Cribiore, 175, 6.

[127] Browning, 856, 7.

[128] Marrou, 102.

between educational levels were blurred."[129] Due to the fact that not all students had the scholastic ability or financial resources to go through the three period curriculum, adaptations were made to suit some students. Students were satisfied with part of the educational curriculum based on their ambition in life or the career they were to pursue. "Only about one-sixth of Libanius's students, for instance, attended classes for five or six years…. Two years of study were often sufficient to be able to plead in court, and students who had relatively modest means and/or wanted to obtain immediate rewards frequently opted to stop at this point."[130]

If students were to follow the standard model of education they would proceed in the following steps. The small child was expected to spend the first seven years in the care of his parents, especially his mother or nanny, during which time the child would learn how to speak the language and receive some cultivation in his or her manners. "He [the child] was introduced into the social life and shown how to behave, how to be well mannered and polite, and also given some kind of moral discipline—some of the 'nurses' used to check the child and try to develop his will by means of strict rules, and by treatment that, considering his age, was extremely harsh."[131] After this period the child was sent to school. At this stage, both boys and girls went to school, although most probably nothing much was expected of the young girls and more attention was devoted to male students.[132] Though communal education was more normative in the Hellenistic age, primary education remained for the most part private.[133] If the child was to attend school, the pedagogue (παιδαγωγός)—the family servant—was to take the child to and from school every day. This job included carrying the child's belongings, sometimes even carrying the child

---

[129] Cribiore, 190. Browning reached the exact same conclusion as Cribiore. He wrote, "The traditional three-stage system—elementary literacy, grammar and rhetoric—was maintained throughout the fifth and sixth century and later, though the distinction between the various stages tended to become more blurred than in earlier periods." Browning, 856.

[130] Cribiore, 224.

[131] Marrou, 142.

[132] Marrou writes that terra-cottas discovered in Alexandria and elsewhere "portray little school girls at work." Ibid., 144.

[133] The ephebia and the gymnasium were the two educational stages that attracted state funding, when possible. Since the sense of the importance of education suffered at various historical epochs, the benefactors εὐεργέτης were asked to contribute, which later became a title of renown. However primary schooling still remained more of a private enterprise. Ibid., 112.

himself, and protecting the child on their way to school.[134] The pedagogue was entrusted with the moral education of the child in addition to overseeing that the child completed the homework. Therefore, his job was complementary to the educator or instructor whose job was to impart education proper, that is, learning the alphabet, reading, writing, mathematics, and so forth.[135] The role of the pedagogue became increasingly important until it began to lose its etymological sense and took the sense of "an educator in the full sense of the word."[136]

Primary schooling began with reading the alphabet, then syllables, words, and finally texts and anthologies. This entire process was done almost twice, once orally through brute recitation of everything the students learned, and another time through writing the letters, syllables, and sentences again in their entirety. Primary education included learning how to count and do basic arithmetic that was crucial for managing the finances and formal affairs in their adult life.[137]

Since primary education was mostly private, it is probable that Cyril—after arriving at the patriarchal residence at the age of seven or so—was immediately entrusted with a private tutor.[138] The patriarchal residence included a great number of grammarians, scribes, shorthand secretaries, and other literary professionals, such as translators, that were indispensable for managing ecclesiastical matters. Pope Theophilus must have chosen one or more of his able staff to tutor Cyril in the basics of reading and writing. As to the moral part of his education, that was usually the responsibility of the pedagogue, it might have been taken care of by monastics or residing priests. His moral education would have been completed by the end of his five-year stay in the Desert.

---

[134] The child belongings could be rather a burden to carry since books were bulky and heavy. Some of the books that were made of parchment were so heavy to the extent they were used as weapons in fights with other students. Cribiore, 144, 145.

[135] Marrou, 143–4.

[136] Ibid., 144.

[137] Marrou has a detailed description of the lengthy time spent in meticulous memorization in every stage of the process of education. Marrou also adds that his understanding of the primary system of education is primarily based on school exercise books found in Upper Egypt. This is what makes all this information even more relevant to Cyril's education. Marrou, 150–159.

[138] Theophilus became pope in A.D. 385 when Cyril was at the age of seven. This point will be elaborated under "The Alexandrian Cultural Milieu at the Time of Cyril."

Secondary education, which began at the age of fourteen, included the study of classics with a great stress on Homer. The study of classics meant reading, reciting, and explanation of the texts, that is, exegesis. During this study morals and composition were stressed with an added emphasis on grammar. This stage of education was taught by grammarians—γραμματικός—sometimes known as φιλόλογος.[139] The grammarians were concerned with the teaching of classics, and since the pool of literature from which they could draw was huge and was constantly increasing, some texts were selected on the basis that they were quite representative of the classical genre for teaching purposes.[140] Homer was the most selected and dominated the curriculum. The number of papyri, writing tablets, and ostraca that were pulled from the soil of Egypt shows "the place Homer had in the education of Greek Egypt."[141] Some of the other classical writers who found their way to the curriculum with Homer were Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Menander.[142] The students did not read the texts directly,

---

[139] Ibid., 161.

[140] This is known from school exercise books found mostly in Egypt. These school exercises played a great role in the manuscript transmission of classical literature. Marrou, 403–4.

[141] Marrou, 163. St. Cyril quoted Homer more than once in his writings and most probably his knowledge of Homer came primarily from his education by the grammarian. St. Cyril's use of classical works will be dealt with in Chapter 3. Bagnall concludes, based on archeological findings, that classical reading in the fourth and fifth century Egypt is dominated by Homer and Menander. Other authors are found but not in such abundance such as Aeschylus, Sophocles, Pindar, Sappho, and Theocritus. Bagnall suggests that the decline of reading in these authors is due to the rise of new authors which were found in greater number such as Dio Chrysostom, Themistios, Philostratos, Himerius, Heliodoros, and Libanius. These classical authors were found with Old and New Testament books, non-canonical books of the early church together with exercise books. R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103.

[142] Marrou, 163. These authors were found in the same list as that of Bagnall. Cribiore in her most recent research gave more attention to this point and also concluded, based on archeological data, that Homer was also by far the most read and taught poet of all times. She asserts that Homer was mandatory in the educational curriculum. She also concluded that Euripides was the next favored author but in Egypt, Menander was a favorite choice. She adds the following names as being also frequently used: Callimachus, Pindar, Theognis, Hipponax, Aratus, Theocritus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Isorates. Cribiore, 194–204. It is most probable that students in the grammar schools read these authors in their school exercises and after graduating kept interest in these authors together with other

rather the texts were introduced through a summary or outline of the work. After the students' texts were compared to that of the teacher—some sort of textual critical analysis was done since no two manuscripts were the same—reading the text followed. Reading was a rather complicated process. Reading, whether private or public, was audible. The reason was that texts were written in "continuous script," meaning there was no "division between words, sentences, or paragraphs, and no punctuation."[143] Therefore, reading meant that the student had to understand the text well enough to be able to read the continuous script and give expression to the unpunctuated text. This continuous process of reading and rereading of the text in preparation for public reading led the grammarians to emphasize memorization as a faculty that would facilitate expressive reading. The process of reading also included exegesis of the text. This was a principal academic tool that the grammarian taught his students in order to be efficient readers.[144] Ignorance of the meaning of the text hindered the reader from producing an understandable expressive outcome. In other words, good readers had to be good exegetes. It is most probable that Cyril was selected to be a reader when he reached this academic level, in which, he acquired good knowledge of the biblical text together with other church writings to enable him to read church reading efficiently.

This description of the educational system makes Severus' comments even more poignant, "…so when he [Cyril] read the book once, he knew it by heart…" on Cyril's return to the patriarchal residence "…he read aloud in his [Theophilus] presence; and the priests and learned men and philosophers were astonished at him,…."[145] Here we find the process of reading and memorizing as part of Cyril's education. The practice of "reading aloud" required understanding the meaning of the text, exegesis, thus arriving to the utmost level of reading proficiency.

Secondary education included the study of the moral aspects of these texts. "From the poets, especially Homer, Hellenistic teachers tried to extract a fully articulated moral code. The prime movers in this endeavor

---

Christian literature. Cribiore mentions that some of the Bodmer papyri contain codices that include Christian works together with Menander's. Cribiore, 200.

[143] Gamble, 202.

[144] "Dionysius considered the highest skill that grammarians practiced the 'critical study of literature,' that is, exegesis, textual criticism, aesthetic evaluation and judgment of the authenticity of a text." Cribiore, 186. When discussing the style and method of Cyril's exegesis, we will notice the influence of his grammarian training on his exegetical method.

[145] Evetts, 428.

were the Stoics. In their hands Homer became "the wisest of poets," a romantic Wise man, intentionally concealing under the veil of myth a complete and detailed body of doctrine."[146] This process was accompanied with the "methodical study of the elements of the language: what we call 'grammar.'"[147] The final element to complete the picture of a thorough grammarian course was composition which was in the form of "preparatory exercises"—προγυμνάσματα. Though composition was essentially the duty of the rhetors, for practical reasons "as the more advanced rhetoric became increasingly technical and more and more exacting, it became a matter of necessity for higher education to hand preparatory exercises over to the secondary school and so, by force of circumstances, they were "usurped" by the grammarian."[148] Since the Hellenistic system of education was to give the harder exercises first and then the easier ones, by the time the student finished his education with the grammarian he was an extremely able writer and—if he had the talent—a poetry composer. Thus, at the age of seventeen when Cyril headed to the Desert, he completed about eighty-five percent of his education. He was an able writer and had a good sense of rhetoric.

When the people in the Eastern Empire, including Egyptians, accepted Christianity the Greek educational system was already well established. All the great fathers of the church acquired their education through this system. This raised a lot of questions, such as whether the church accepted the learning of "morals" in grammar schools from Homer and others. Due to the fact that in the Eastern parts of the Empire Christianity was introduced into the context of a previously well-established pagan culture and civilization, education was never totally Christianized. Homer was still taught by Christian grammarians to their Christian students, albeit with a more Christian interpretation.[149] We find in exercise books from some Egyptian ostraca that exercises included extracts from the Psalms or a composition exercise with the subject title, "Relate the miracle of Christ and

[146] Marrou, 169.

[147] Ibid., 170.

[148] Ibid, 172.

[149] Julian the Apostate knew that Christian teachers had their own interpretation of the Homeric and other classical texts and thus he promulgated that "Christians who taught Homer and Hesiod without believing in the gods they described were accused of failing in honesty and candor by teaching something they did not believe. They were ordered either to apostate or to give up teaching." This decree did not work for long and the code was overturned and Christians resumed teaching classics. Marrou, 323–4.

the vine."[150] Christianity, in the early centuries, did not undertake an alternative system nor did it Christianize the educational system but rather added its Christian flavor to the interpretation of the classics with an addition of Christian texts that were primarily Biblical.[151]

The most systematically documented attempt to Christianize the Hellenic educational system we know of was during the reign of Julian the Apostate. When the latter ordered Christian rhetors to restrict their teaching to Christian texts and not attempt to interpret Homer or any other Greek poet, a certain Syrian grammarian by the name of Apollinaris began a daring project. Apollinaris in conjunction with his son, who was also a grammarian of the same name teaching in the same city of Laodicea, endeavored to write the Biblical texts, both Old and New Testaments, in the form of Platonic dialogues. Nevertheless, after the death of Julian, all their efforts were wasted. Christian parents of the upper class thought they would be depriving their children of the standard education that made their children respected among the cultivated elite of the society. In addition, because the educational system and a certain system of Attic writing were extremely ingrained in the pagan culture, scriptural translations were found "intolerable" among the educated elite.[152] It is most probable, that Cyril received most of his knowledge of Greek culture through his education and did not attempt to cultivate it further after he completed his curriculum.

St. Cyril must have had his literary education, both the primary and the secondary, through the tutoring of one of the grammarians residing in the patriarchate. He most likely did not attend the ephesia, which was the physical exercise part of the gymnasium, which by the third century was already considered insignificant in the educational system. This part of his education was most probably replaced by sending him to the Nitrean desert where he focused on the study of scripture and other Christian texts. His stay there strengthened both the moral and spiritual components of his life. By the time he returned from the Desert, he might perhaps have required one or two years in the study of rhetoric after which he became an accomplished rhetor of the highest caliber.

---

[150] Ibid., 331.

[151] This part of the research is discussing the basic educational system, that is, acquiring the basic skills of reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, and rhetoric. This discussion will not include the School of Alexandria or the catechetical school, which was a school of higher education in theological studies where the students admitted were already well established rhetors and grammarians.

[152] A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*: *284–602*, vol. 2, (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1986), 1006.

Study of Rhetoric

During the Hellenistic period, the real essence of being educated was to take lessons in rhetoric, that is, to learn the art of eloquence. Theophilus must have known the importance of such an education for his nephew if he expected anything of him. Moreover, Alexandria was the best place to provide such an education. Theoretically, there were three kinds of rhetorical training, the deliberative, the judicial, and the epideictic. Only epideictic, or the eloquence of set speech, survived, developed, and even flourished. It flourished in a culture that was very rhetorical and public speakers gradually became in demand, more powerful, and their eloquence was used for political and even military mediation. Rhetoric was the ultimate goal of any esteemed education. To learn rhetoric entailed, with eloquence of speech, an ability to be a thinker and acquire logical thinking. It was the means to be a cultured person. This common culture was a unifying factor that enabled Hellenistic as well as Christian literature to circulate and be accessible to all churches.[153]

Rhetoric was divided into three parts: theory, study of models, and applied exercises. Theory meant knowing the exact steps, stages, divisions and subdivisions in any topic that could be the subject of rhetoric.[154] The study of theory ensured that the most ungifted student could still become an orator if the steps of theory were meticulously followed. Then came the study of models, where a set of typical masterpieces of universally admired rhetoric was studied to the greatest detail, interpreted, memorized, and then read aloud. It was under a rhetor that one learned how to "read." Furthermore, if Cyril reached such excellence in reading as Severus noted, then he must have had some rhetorical study, which is confirmed by his style of writing. The third stage was applied exercises. These exercises tended to be actual speeches delivered in law courts or the assembly. In the case of Cyril, his exercises were conducted within the church or patriarchal residence. When Cyril reached such a level of education, he must have been promoted from reader to teacher-reader, where he taught scripture. It was from these exercises that Cyril developed his exegetical works.[155]

---

[153] The idea that παιδεία and rhetoric are the unifying factor in the Hellenistic culture is explored in Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992).

[154] Marrou gives detailed steps of eulogy. The student of rhetoric was to study all the thirty-six stages of eulogizing and had to follow them to the iota. The student could add more points in his exercise but he had to prove that he knew all the basic points by heart in order to be considered a rhetor. Marrou, 198–199.

[155] Marrou, 194–205.

Libraries in Alexandria

Libraries exist wherever there are any cultural or educational activities. Most Hellenistic gymnasiums had libraries. These libraries were rather small, most probably very small in comparison to our modern day standards and accommodated primarily the needs of the study in the gymnasium.[156] Every local church had its small library that held at least the basic texts used for liturgical purposes and texts of all the books of the Old and New Testaments. Anianus wrote in the early fifth century that "all church libraries of the Greeks" held works of St. John Chrysostom.[157] Church libraries usually collected a number of sermons written by famous fathers of the church that could serve for liturgical purposes at different occasions. These sermons were also used for educational purposes. Scholarly bishops typically had a library of considerable size. For example, the library of St. Augustine is known to have escaped the destruction of the Vandals even though the valuable content of the library is unknown, but we know that it included works of Christian and non-Christian writers.[158]

We are sure that the city of Alexandria had at least three main libraries that were accessible to Cyril: the Library of Alexandria, the library of the catechetical school, and the patriarchal library. We know that the famous Library of Alexandria included pagan, classical, as well as religious books. The most celebrated religious text of all was the Septuagint that was specifically translated for the use of the Library.[159] Pope Theophilus had been constantly accused of destroying the Library of Alexandria. The accusation is actually limited to the part of the library annexed to the Serapeum. None of the Christian chronicles of the period record the A.D. 391 destruction of the Serapeum. What we know is that Pope Theophilus "attempted to turn one of the temples of the city into a church. After a resistance from the pagan side, which led to street-fighting and much destruction, Theophilus obtained the approval of the emperor Theodosius I for closing all the temples, including the Serapeum."[160] Most probably Cyril

---

[156] Marrou, 410.

[157] Gamble, 169.

[158] Ibid., 168.

[159] For further study on the Library of Alexandria refer to Roy MacLeod, ed., *The Library of Alexandria, Centre of Learning in the Ancient World* (London, New York: L. B. Tauris, 2000). Also, Gamble for a general view about the use and importance of libraries in the Christian world.

[160] MacLeod, 73. Historians flashed this activity as a sign of the despot character of Theophilus. Historians usually narrate this incident as the destruction not the conversion of the Serapeum. But these incidents have to be understood

would not have had much use for the pagan literature stored in the Serapeum—his concern would have been primarily with the Christian texts.

The library of the catechetical school might have been the one of most use to Cyril, and he would have had easy access to it. In addition, he could have had access to the personal library of Didymus himself. We do know that personal libraries constituted a major recourse for lending and copying of early manuscripts. The patriarchal library must have had an elaborate archive, at least all the patriarchal correspondence, Festal Letters, and the many other Christian literary works. Emperor Constans asked St. Athanasius to copy the text of Scriptures and send it for use in Italian churches.[161] At the council of Ephesus, Cyril used citations from texts by the following writers to back his arguments: Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius, Julius of Rome, Felix of Rome, Theophilus, Cyprian of Carthage, Ambrose of Milan, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa.[162] Having access to all these texts proves that he had a considerable Christian library, although whether the texts were personal copies or that of the patriarchate is not clear. This library not only included the writings of the fathers but also that of heretics. Cyril, in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, attempts to refute heretical teachings. In his exposition of Jn 14:11 he referred to a booklet or pamphlet of his adversaries (βιβλιδιῳ τῶν δὶ ἐναντίας) that he had in his possession and cited from it with the intention of refuting their claims.[163] In the early part of the commentary, Cyril refuted one heresy after another and is clearly working from available texts. What is apparent is that he had access to a library, a

---

within their historical context. It was at the time of Emperor Theodosius who had recently promulgated laws to outlaw all pagan religious activity. Under the rule of Emperor Theodosius, and by the injunction of these laws, it was the duty of the bishop of each city to see that this law was carried out. The execution of these laws occurred with the support of the Empire aided with troops of men, sometimes called *parabalani*, provided by the state to assist the bishop when enforcing the law. Theophilus would not have been the only bishop to enforce these laws, though he might be one who executed them with great zeal. For the obligations of the bishops towards the state consult *Clyde Pharr*, translator, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), 440–486. Book 16 and the Sirmondian Constitutions deal directly with the regulations of the church, obligations of bishops, and other religious groups in the empire like Jews and pagans.

[161] Athanasius *Ad imperatorem Constantium Apologia* 4 (PG 25.600–1).

[162] McGuckin, 86.

[163] *In Jo.* 2.434.

library that contained a large collection of both patristic and heretical texts since both types of texts are evident in his work.

The Alexandrian cultural milieu at the time of Cyril

It is important to understand the surroundings that shaped Cyril in his formative, young years. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the elements that influenced the shaping of the mind and character of Cyril. Theophilus took him into the patriarchate at a tender age. Theophilus was pope of Alexandria for twenty-eight years (385–412) and Theophilus ascended the see of St. Mark when Cyril was only seven years old. There is no account of when Cyril was summoned to the patriarchal residence—it could have been a few months or a few years later. However, when we read the intense interest of Theophilus in the cultivation of his nephew's cultural and educational prospects we can assume it was at an early age, maybe that of seven. This is not unique for Theophilus, for we know that this same thing happened to him at the time of St. Athanasius, who saw the potential of the young Theophilus, even before he was baptized, and recruited him in the patriarchal care at a very tender age. Theophilus was certainly influenced by this incident in his life that led him to take the apostolic mantle after St. Athanasius, and wanted to do the same thing with his blood relative, Cyril.[164]

[164] Being a protégée of a promising young boy seems to have been a recurring theme that devleped into some sort of a tradition in the Church of Alexandria. We know that Athanasius was chosen by Alexander in his youth, Athanasius chose Theophilus at a young age when he visited the Patriarchate, and Theophilus in turn chose Cyril in his childhood. The story of Theophilus aforementioned is based on John of Nikiu's account. The story of Athanasius is quoted by Rufinus *H.E.* 1.14, and Socrates *H.E.* 1.15 who mentions that his story is based on Rufinus' account. Sozomen in *H.E.* 2.17 mentions the same story independently. The story of St. Athanasius goes as follows. It was customary for the Church of Alexandria to celebrate the martyrdom of Pope Peter of Alexandria, with the agnomen of "The Seal of the Martyrs." During this annual celebration, headed at the time by Pope Alexander of Alexandria (A.D. 312–328), Athanasius and some of his friends were playing on the shore. Alexander watched them carefully and noticed they were playing bishop and catechumens who were baptized by the bishop. The careful reenactment of the ritual obligated Alexander to call the young Athanasius to his presence. After questioning the young boy, he recognized that he had a most talented and promising young man in his presence. He oversaw his education and made sure he was well versed in grammar and rhetoric. Alexander then appointed Athanasius as his secretary. (Sozomen *H.E.* 2.17). This story is considered legendary by a few scholars based on some chronological discrepancies that

Most probably it did not take Theophilus a long time to decide the educational curriculum and future of the young Cyril and he summoned him quickly to Alexandria to be under his supervision. The patriarchal residence became the new dwelling of the young boy, which would later turn out to be his true and only home until the day of his death. Cyril soon became quite accustomed to the talk, intrigues, policy, and politics of the patriarchal residence. He had not experienced anything else other than that atmosphere apart from his short five-year stay in the Nitrean desert. He became accustomed to seeing the political, ecclesiastical, intellectual, and social dignitaries come in and out of the patriarchal residence. Since this study focuses on the writings of Cyril, we will limit our research to the ecclesiastical and intellectual figures that might have had an influence on him. Besides the monastic figures that influenced him, we can safely suggest that Theophilus must have had a great impact on Cyril. In addition, we can include the figures of Didymus the Blind, Rufinus of Aquileia, and Jerome. The focus on these three individuals is not exclusive, and does not mean that they were the only people who could have influenced the young Cyril. They are just an example of many who passed through the threshold of the patriarchal residence and of whom we have an account.

Pope Theophilus was historically famous for his role in the Origenist controversy, the exile of St. John Chrysostom, and his zeal to eradicate paganism from Egypt. History informs us that in A.D. 391, with the permission of Emperor Theodosius I, he attempted to convert the temple of Serapis, known as the Serapium, and also the Mithraeum, and the temple of Dionysos to churches. Nevertheless, it was the Origenist controversy that developed to a heated confrontation between Theophilus and John Chrysostom that overshadowed any other endeavor that Theophilus accomplished and marred his character forever in history books. Since the details of this regrettable episode in history are documented elsewhere, unfortunately for the most part by his opponents, we will focus on another aspect of Theophilus' character—we will examine Theophilus the theologian, writer, and educator.

Athanasius would have been the age of fourteen when this incident happened and thus would already been too old. Even if the story is legendary, what concerns us is that it was written by Rufinus, who was a student and disciple to the Alexandrian Church for some time, thus this story must have been propagating among the Alexandrians at the time of Theophilus and must have been a moral example for him to follow, since he himself was a beneficiary of such an act of benevolence himself.

Little of Theophilus' writings and intellectual heritage survived. There is no indication that he was a prolific writer but what is left of his work will shed light on the Theophilus that influenced Cyril. His writings are comprised of epistles, Paschal Letters, homilies, the Paschal canon, and treatises. Some of these epistles survived through the Latin translations and are preserved in Jerome's letters. The correspondence is concerned with the Origenist controversy and the consequent trouble caused by the Tall Brothers and John Chrysostom. Through the study of his refutation of Origenism we can perceive the theological mind of Theophilus. His Paschal Letters were available for some time, at least until the Council of Chalcedon where Timothy Ailuros mentioned Theophilus' third paschal letter in the dogmatic argumentation of the council. Some of his homilies survive and they present some of the pastoral concerns of the bishop. For instance, he wrote on the themes of judgment, penance, contrition and abstinence, the institution of the Eucharist.[165] Another famous and popular spurious writing is his vision of the flight of the Holy Family to Egypt and their residence there.[166] Theophilus did not write any commentaries or dogmatic treatises. The focus was primarily pastoral which included fighting Origenism. He was theologically astute or he would not have had Rufinus as a disciple and Jerome as a strong advocate.

The friendship between Theophilus and Jerome flourished with the Origenist controversy. Though Jerome was a reader and translator of Origen, as well as another Alexandrian, Dydimus the Blind, when the controversy arose he signed against Origen. Meanwhile, his friend and compatriot Rufinus of Aquila refused to follow his lead and did not sign against Origen. The situation became very complicated and involved John, the bishop of Jerusalem. Theophilus intervened and solved the disagreement and in this way gained Jerome as a friend and a strong supporter of all Theophilus' further fights against Origenism.[167] Jerome translated all of Theophilus' correspondence pertaining to Origenism into Latin and promoted his position in the West. The strength of the friendship between Theophilus and Jerome was exhibited when Jerome's good friend Paula died. Her passing devastated Jerome. He did not have any literary

[165] For a full reference to all of what survived of his homilies refer to Quasten 3.104.

[166] Though most scholars consider this work as spurious, it is a very popular reading to this day among the Copts. And the reverence of the work is due to the attribution of the authorship to Cyril who recounts the vision of Theophilus.

[167] J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 195–209.

activity for a long time but this was interrupted when he translated Theophilus' Paschal Letter of the year 404 into Latin.[168] His obligation and strong friendship to Theophilus forced him out of his mourning. Jerome previously wrote to Theophilus saying, "You caress as a father, instruct as a teacher, enjoin as a bishop…You do not demand subjection from your monks; they are therefore all the more subject to you. You offer them a kiss and so they bow their necks."[169] This quote shows the great respect that Jerome developed for Theophilus. Through the stormy times of the Origenist controversy, there is no doubt that Theophilus must have expressed and shared with Cyril the mutual friendship between them. There is a great probability that this led Cyril to be acquainted with Jerome's literary activity since they both shared a passion for biblical exposition.

Jerome's influence on Cyril raised recently interest among some scholars. The research carried out by most scholars was primarily based on comparing Old Testament exegetical works of Jerome and Cyril with a special focus on the commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets.[170] However, in special reference to this work, we cannot proof any influence from Jerome since there is not mention of Jerome ever writing a commentary on the Gospel of John. Our interest at this point is the intellectual milieu of Cyril, researchers not only agree that Cyril was acquainted with Jerome's work but also other Old Testament exegetical works like those of Eusebius of Caesarea and Basil of Caesarea.

---

[168] Kelly, 278.

[169] *Letter* 82; quoted in Kelly, 208.

[170] F. M. Abel, "Parallelisme éxégetique entre S. Jérôme et S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Vivre et Penser. Recherches d'exegèse et d'histoire*, 1re série, 94–119, 212–30. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1941). Kerrigan, a decade later, was at first skeptical about Abel's conclusions but after further research conceded to the results. He asserts that Cyril had some literary dependence on Jerome. But he finally concludes that Cyril consulted other commentaries like those of Origen, Eusebius, and St. Basil but did not follow them blindly. Kerrigan writes in regard to Jerome, "…Cyril consulted Jerome frequently. It has been shown that Cyril does not adhere to his model slavishly; he criticizes Jerome's opinions at times; he abandons him, when and to the extent that he pleases; even when he depends on him, Cyril sometimes manages to add new details or paraphrases his materials freely." Kerrigan, 438–9. The latest research conducted in 1998 by Fernández Lois suggests a "strong probability" of Jerome's influence on Cyril though there is no "absolute certainty." Russell, 226. Further details and references to Jerome's influence on Cyril can be consulted in Russell, 70–1, 225–6.

If scholars suggest the thesis that Jerome influenced Cyril, we can also propose that Didymus the Blind influenced both Jerome and Cyril. Jerome writes of Didymus,

> Here we have a man who has reached perfection without a teacher, so as to be a vehicle of the spirit and a self-taught genius. He surpasses Cicero in eloquence, Aristotle in argument, Plato in discretion, Aristarchus in learning, Didymus, that man of brass, in the number of his books; and not only Didymus, but all the writers of his time in his knowledge of the Scriptures.[171]

Jerome's respect for Didymus can easily explain the commonality between Cyril and Jerome, if this proposal stands.

The third figure involved in the Origenist controversy was Rufinus of Aquileia. As previously mentioned, he was a good friend and compatriot of Jerome. They both shared their interest in Origen before the controversy broke out. He spent seven years in Egypt, from 373–380, where he studied in the school of Alexandria under the tutorship of Didymus the Blind. It is likely that during this time he formed an acquaintance with Theophilus. Rufinus left Egypt five years before the appointment of Theophilus to the episcopal see of Alexandria. Although Jerome denies Rufinus' discipleship to Didymus in *Apology* 3,18, Kelly thinks "his denial is not convincing."[172] Rufinus did not produce a literary work that distinguished him as a theologian in his own right since his work is primarily translation and there is not much of his own mind that we can perceive. Though there is no way to ensure the issue of Rufinus' discipleship to Didymus, there is historic probability. This shows how Alexandria and the School of Alexandria, headed at that time by Didymus the Blind, were the meeting places of people who later played a pivotal role in ecclesiastical history and a leading role in the preservation of a Christian heritage.[173]

Didymus the Blind was the head of the school of Alexandria until the time of his death in 398 at the age of 85. He was highly respected for his erudition as well as his exemplary life. He lived as an ascetic and met with St. Antony more than once. His most famous students were Rufinus and Jerome, where the former called him "prophet" and "apostolic."[174] He died when Cyril was twenty years of age. Cyril must have met with him, listened to some of his lectures, and absorbed a love of biblical scholarship from

---

[171] Jerome *Ep.* 50.2. CSEL 54.388.

[172] Kelly, 205.

[173] It is primarily through Rufinus' Latin translations of Origen that many of the latter's work reached us.

[174] Rufinus *Apologia contra Hieronymum* 2.25. CCL 20 (29–123).

him in addition to his influence as an ascetic person. Though there is no indication as to whether Cyril attended or studied in the School of Alexandria, there is no reason to suggest that he did not make use of the presence of such a figure in the cultural capital. We do understand from the correspondence of St. Jerome that such an interaction was indeed possible. He writes to Pammachius and Oceanus,

> In my younger days I was carried away with a great passion for learning, yet I was not like some presumptuous enough to teach myself. At Antioch I frequently listened to Apolinaris of Laodicea, and attended his lectures; yet, although he instructed me in the holy scriptures, I never embraced his disputable doctrine as to their meaning. At length my head became sprinkled with gray hairs so that I looked more like a master than a disciple. Yet I went on to Alexandria and heard Didymus. And I have much to thank him for: for what I did not know I learned from him, and what I knew already I did not forget. So excellent was his teaching.[175]

This important correspondence makes us understand that the School of Alexandria, and the scholars residing in it, not only gave lectures within the regular curriculum, if there was anything as such, but also provided an intellectual atmosphere where visiting and interested people attended some sort of public lectures given by the residing scholars. There is no doubt that Cyril attended some of these public lectures, either presented by Didymus himself or other lecturers.[176]

---

[175] Jerome *Ep.* 84.3. CSEL 55.24.

[176] Marrou in his study makes it clear that there were two types of lectures. The first type was called "lessons—σχολαί—given by the grammarians, rhetors and philosophers" and there is another type called "ἀκροάσεις." He explains that the first type can be considered as "whole courses" while the second type of lectures were "additional lectures given more or less on their own." I. H. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, translated by G. Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 409–410. It is to the latter type that we refer to. This is confirmed by the description of Jerome in his epistle and this is the type of lectures that Cyril most probably would have attended in the School of Alexandria, since we do not have any reference that Cyril had a formal and continuous education in the most famous theological school of Alexandria. There is another type of lecture given by "wandering lecturers" that were "addressed to adults living in a polite society." Marrou, 187. This could have been another type of education that the school of Alexandria provided for its adult education. There is a possibility that Jerome, or any dignitary visiting the city, gave such lectures during their stay in Alexandria for a few months.

Grillmeier writes, "The Cyril of the early period takes a great deal, indeed almost everything, from Athanasius…The young Cyril surely knew the blind teacher of Alexandria, Didymus. The two belong to the same thought-world. Nevertheless, we cannot say that Didymus exercised a real influence."[177] Both, Didymus and Cyril, rightfully belonged "to the same thought-world." If influence is only measured by the transmission of thought from one theologian to the other, as in the case of Athanasius and Cyril, then we can accede to Grillmeier's comment. However, if the intellectual dialogue and complementation of thought among Didymus and Cyril can also measure influence, then Grillmeier's statement needs some amendments. The following example can shed light on this indirect influence.

Grillmeier describes the contribution of Didymus to the Arian controversy in that he evaluates "Christ's soul in its theological aspect."[178] The importance of this addition is that he insists that in the Incarnation, Jesus Christ assumed the full humanity, body together with the soul and spirit. At the time of the Appollinarian controversy, this was a bold suggestion since the Apollinarians proposed that the presence of the soul in the assumed humanity would advance the idea that the Logos incarnate is liable to sin. That Christ can sin is an unacceptable theological premise on the basis of Christ's words "Which of you convicts me of sin?" (Jn 8:46). Didymus expressed his idea as follows,

> Now as the soul which Jesus took is something other than the Trinity (ἄλλη ἐστὶν παρὰ τὴν Τριάδα), it is by nature created to endure *propatheia* and the beginning of amazement (πέφυκὲ δέχεσθαι προπάθειαν καὶ ἀρχὴν τοῦ θαμβεῖσθαι).[179]

Didymus asserts the presence of a soul that endures προπάθεια. Lampe defines the meaning of προπάθεια as the "first stage of emotion."[180] One cannot but notice that Lampe cites the word in only three works, all of which are expositions of the Book of Psalms, written by Origen, Didymus, and Cyril of Alexandria. We know that Cyril studied Origen very closely and wrote a lengthy comment refuting Origen's ideas in his systematic refutation of all heretical ideas in *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. We also know that Didymus was a good disciple of Origen's ideas and shared

---

[177] A. Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, trans. John Bowden, vol. 1 (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 418.

[178] Ibid., 362.

[179] Text XVIII, 10, 4–5; quoted in Grillmeier, 363.

[180] Lampe, 1161.

the anathema pronounced in the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 553. Though we cannot speak of "influence" here, this continuous thread of thought can only affirm the dialogue of ideas among these three Alexandrian theologians.

The idea of Christ's sinlessness was elaborated by Didymus in his *Commentary on the Psalms*, though the idea never reached the conclusion of "the impossibility of Christ's sinning."[181] The further contribution of Cyril to the idea of the sinlessness of Christ is found in his exposition of Jn 8:46, "Which of you convicts me of sin?" He follows Didymus' route in choosing to explain the sinlessness of Christ on a theological basis as opposed to a psychological one. Cyril explains that sin is the "turning away from what is better to that which is not [better]" (παρατροπῆς τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίονος ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ οὕτως).[182] The process of turning away entails change, and in the case of sin it is a change from what is better to what is not so. Nonetheless, God does not experience "change" for He is immutable. Cyril clarifies his statement by saying how we could perceive the immutable God to not experience change, He who is steadfast in His own unshaken good which is not of another but of Himself (ἀκλόνητος δὲ μᾶλλον τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐμπεφυκόσιν ἀγαθοῖς, καὶ οὐ παρ᾽ ἑτέρου τινὸς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ).[183] This type of interaction of ideas is not that of promoting and propagating the same idea but rather that of elaboration and continuation. Cyril elaborated on the sinlessness of Christ and confirmed it to be based on his immutability.

Grillmeier, among other scholars, also noted that the term Θεοτόκος was frequently used by Alexandrian writers such as Athanasius and Didymus.[184] Obviously we can add Cyril's name to this list without hesitation. Though in reference to this term the influence of Athanasius is undoubtable, the presence of Didymus' name on the list has its significance for understanding that the chain of transmission is multifaceted. Grillmeier adds that one can find in Cyril's work some "Aristotelian definitions of man with reference to Didymus, but these do not signify any transference of an Aristotelian anthropology to christology."[185] We cannot say that Cyril was a student or disciple of Didymus, for neither history nor the writings of both theologians could promote this suggestion. However, we can consider a degree of interaction of thought, based on the previous examples together

[181] Grillmeier, 363.
[182] *In Jo.*, 2:102.
[183] Ibid.
[184] Grillmeier, 298.
[185] Ibid., 416.

with the clear presence of both theologians within the same city at the same time span. They not only shared time and lived within the same city boundaries, they also shared friends, intellectual and theological interests, a common heritage, and an undying devotion to the church of Alexandria that bound both of them to one body of believers.

Theophilus, Rufinus, and Jerome all shared the acquaintance of Didymus the Blind. We also know that Palladius visited Didymus four times. Alexandria and the school of Alexandria was the center of this circle of friends, although later their paths diverged. Alexandria lured many other men, but this group serves as an example of the type of Christian intellectuals that this great metropolis attracted. Cyril was not living in a vacuum or in isolation. He was in an intellectual center that attracted substantial men who eventually shaped his vision and broadened his horizon to the greater church beyond the boundaries of Alexandria. Cyril was exposed in his home setting to a diverse school of ecclesiastical politics, public relations, intellectual excitement, and virtuous people. He was at the hub of events and culture, not only that of the Christian culture but also the pagan one.

Intellectual activities not only occurred in the premises of the School of Alexandria. The patriarchal residence was another center of intellectual and spiritual activity. Severus, bishop of El-Ashmunein writes, "…and there Cyril dwelt with the patriarch in his cell, and read aloud in his presence; and the priests and learned men and philosophers were astonished at him…."[186] Any patriarchal residence, and especially that of Alexandria, was a busy place. Bishops and priests came to consult or give reports about their parishes. Monks would come to do the same thing. The famous monastic tradition of at least two visits per year to the pope, one on the Feast of the Nativity and another on that of the Resurrection, became a staple in the residence. The record of these visits can be found in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* and in the *Life of St. Pachomius*. Popes gave regular biblical study sessions in the residence, to both men and women, as attested during the life of St. Athanasius. The presence of lectors and cantors in residence was another aspect of activity. Scribes and shorthand secretaries were always present in the residence. They copied official letters and statements needed in the patriarchate. The Church of Alexandria had translators that completed translations from and to Latin. St. Cyril writes to Celestine, "I issued documents containing excerpts from the principal statements. I caused them to be translated as far as it was possible for men in Alexandria,

[186] *PO*, 428.

and I have given to the beloved Posidonius the letters written by me, commanding him to bring them to your holiness."[187] From this incredibly short statement we can sense the constant need of scribes and translators. The scribes preserved the letters of Nestorius and copied excerpts from them together with copies of St. Cyril's letters that were sent to various churches. The translators were translating letters of correspondence, as the one mentioned above, if not other literary works, maybe that of Jerome. Scribes and shorthand secretaries accompanied bishops when they attended synods or councils to take minutes of the meetings. These would be different from the scribes and shorthand secretaries designated by the emperor and who later provided the "official" minutes of the council. We also know that shorthand secretaries became indispensable beginning around the fourth and fifth century because they sat at the foot of the bishop and took note of the sermons. The most famous are the shorthand secretaries of St. John Chrysostom who recorded all his homilies in shorthand form. We also know of St. Augustine following the same pattern. This was practiced in both the East and the West. This has become standard practice in all major sees by the fourth and fifth centuries.[188] It is probable that it was one of those literary men who began instructing Cyril in the first principles of reading and writing.

The Date of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*

Mahé, in the first decade of the twentieth century, disagreed with previous scholars who suggested that *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* was written after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy.[189] These scholars have presented two basic arguments. The first concerned Cyril showing some progress in the use of the literal sense. Mahé responded by writing that the change was due to the alteration of topic. He explained that in the *De Adoratione* and *Glaphyres*, Cyril is demonstrating that the Old Law is a figure of the New Law, but in the *Commentary on John* he understood the real value of the "spiritual sense" and developed it with the "literal sense" or

---

[187] *ACO* 1.1.5 pp10–12. CPG 5310. A. J. Festugiére, trans., *Ephèse et Chalcédoine Actes des Conciles* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1982), 528–531. McEnerney, 1.64.

[188] Marrou, 312.

[189] Mahé mentions the following preceding scholars: Bardenhewer, *Patrologie* (1894); Ehehard, *Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Schrift* in *Theolog. Quartalschrift* (1888); and Batiffol, *Littérature grecque Chrétienne* (1897). In J. Mahé, "La date du Commentaire de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l'Evangile selon S. Jean," *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 8 (1907): 41.

"historic" sense.[190] The second involved the constant attack on christological dualism, which is a clear characteristic of Nestorius' Christology. Mahé rightfully argued the attack on christological dualism is a general attack on the Antiochene Christology. In other words, Cyril was following the footsteps of Athanasius and Apollinarius. Moreover, Mahé argued that a careful examination of the christological terminology of the *Commentary on John* clarifies that Cyril was not specifically attacking Nestorius. The term Θεοτόκος was not mentioned once, in comparison to the constant presence of the term in all Cyrillian literature after the outbreak of the Nesotian controversy.[191] In addition to this point, other christological terminology concerning the dual or one nature of Christ became more precise in the writings after the Nestorian controversy in comparison to what is used in the *Commentary on John.*[192] With these arguments Mahé set once and for all the date of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* to be before 428.

Current scholarship accepted the date of authorship of *The Commentary of the Gospel of John* to be before 428. The question now is to determine how many years before 428 the commentary was written? Jouassard's work constituted the first attempt to answer this question four decades later. Jouassard began his argument by dividing Cyril's work into two categories, one before Nestorius and the other after Nestorius.[193] What survived of Cyril's work constitutes ten volumes of the Migne. Not to mention Mai's further collection and later discoveries of Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic works not included in the Migne.[194] Therefore, if we confine our reckoning—just for the sake of this argument—to the Migne collection we find that the works written before the Nestorian controversy are as follows:

---

[190] Mahé supplies a lengthy list of references from *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* to support his argument in Mahé, "Date," 42, 43.

[191] Mahé, "Date," 43.

[192] Ibid., 44. He provided extensive reference to prove his argument.

[193] G. Jouassard, "L'activité littèraire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie jusqu'à 428," Mélanges E. Podechard. Lyons: Facultés Catholiques (1945): 159–160.

[194] N. Charlier, "Le Thesaurus de Trinitate de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 45 (1950): 33. Resources in other languages are catalogued in Mavritti Geerard, Clavis Patrum Graecorum, Vol. 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), 1–57. In addition, Jouassard mentioned that there are Armenian fragments from the commentary on Ezekiel attributed to Cyril in the Bodleian Library. In Jouassard, *Activité*, 162, n.2.

1. *De Adoratione et Cultu in Spiritu et Veritate* (περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας) (usually abbreviated as *De Adoratione*) comprise PG 68.
2. *Glaphyra* (*Γλαφυρά*) *comprise* PG 69.9–677.
3. Fragments from Cyril's commentaries on Kings, Psalms, Canticle of Moses, Proverbs, Canticle of Canticles comprise PG 69.679–1293.
4. *Commentary on Isaiah* comprises PG 70.9–1450. The rest of PG 70 comprises fragments from Commentaries on Jeremiah, Baruch, and Daniel.
5. *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai) comprises PG 71.
6. The continuation of the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (Zechariah and Malachi) comprises PG 72.9–365. The rest of PG 72 has fragments from the commentary on the Gospel of Matthew and that on the Gospel of Luke.
7. *Commentary on the Gospel of John PG 73.*
8. The continuation of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* comprises PG 74.9–757.
9. Fragments from commentaries on Acts of the Apostles, Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Hebrews, James, First and Second Peter, First John, and Jude comprise PG 74.758–1026.
10. *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate (Θησαυρός)* comprises PG 75.9–656.
11. *De Trinitate Dialogi i-vii* PG 75.657–1124.
12. *Paschal Letters* from year 414–428 in PG 77.

This makes a total of more than seven volumes of the Migne written before the Nestorian controversy. Seven of these volumes are exegetical works. Only the *Thesaurus* and *De Trinitate* are non-exegetical. The order of writing is rather difficult to deduce and awaits further research but we can assert the following theories. Both *De Adoratione* and *Glaphyra*, are expositions of selected Pentateuch passages, they are complementary works, and both are anti-Arian writings.[195] These two treatises share with *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* one commonality: they are exegetical works geared towards anti-Arian polemics. Jouassard, Charlier, and Liebaert suggested that these three writings are written within the same time frame. Jouassard further proposed that *De Adoratione, Glaphyra*, and the Commentaries on the Minor Prophets together with that of Isaiah were

[195] Jouassard, *Activité*, 161. Charlier, *Thesaurus*, 42.

written before 423. The *Thesaurus* and *De Trinitate* were written between 423 and 425. *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* was written at the beginning of 425.[196] Both Charlier and Liebaert strongly disputed this suggestion. The summary of Jouassard's position was that, in *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Cyril insinuated that he would not repeat writing about a topic on which he had previously written. However, it is necessary to note that, at this point, Cyril was referring to the *Thesaurus.*[197] Both the *De Trinitate* and *Thesaurus* are addressed to the same Memesinos. *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* refers to *De Trinitate.*[198] Based on these three points Jouassard deduced a connection between the three writings and that they had to have been written one after the other. In the First Letter to Nestorius, Cyril writes, "In fact, I say that, while Atticus of happy memory still lived, a book concerning the holy and consubstantial Trinity was composed by me in which also is a treatise about the Incarnation of the only begotten in harmony with which I have now written."[199] Atticus died in October 425. Based on this comment in the letter, Jouassard set his chronology and concluded that *De Trinitate* together with the *Thesaurus* were written sometime between 423 and 425. If these two works preceded *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*, then the latter was written beginning in 425. All the rest of the Old Testament Commentaries were written before that date because none of them include hints of anti-Arian polemic.[200]

Charlier opposed Jouassard's chronology. He, together with Liebaert, agreed that the order of the composition is the *Thesaurus* followed by *De Trinitate* and then the *Commentary on John.* Charlier firmly opposed the fixation of the 425 date. For Charlier, and rightly so, when Atticus "was still alive" could mean any time before his death on October 425.[201] Actually, Atticus was enthroned on March 406 and the *Thesaurus* and *De Trinitate* could have been composed as early as 406 when Cyril was twenty-eight years of age. Charlier, together with Lebon, even suggested that *The*

---

[196] Jouassard, *Activité*, 170.

[197] Cyril remarks that he will not repeat what is said concerning the eternity of the Word with the Father since this has been sufficiently discussed in this book, referring to the *Commentary*, as well as in the *Thesaurus* (ἔν τε τῷ προκειμένῳ βιβλιῳ, καὶ τῷ κατ᾽ ἐπίκλην Θησαυρῷ). *In Jo.* 1.81.

[198] Cyril writes that the Son is by nature God and is not a creature. Commenting on this statement, which is obviously addressed against the Arians, he says that this is sufficiently discussed ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος λόγῳ. *In Jo.* 1.128.

[199] *ACO* 1.1.1 pp2–25. CPG 5302. McEnerney, 1.35–36.

[200] The details of this argument are in Jouassard, *Activité*, 164–166.

[201] Charlier, *Thesaurus*, 62–63.

Commentary on the Gospel of John is Cyril's first exegetical work. Charlier based his thesis on the two possible translations of Cyril's comment in his prologue to the *Commentary on John* where he writes, "ἀρξόμεθα δὲ τῆς Ἰωάννου συγγραφῆς."[202] This could be translated as "we begin the writing of John" or "we begin *with* the writing of John." The former means that the writer is beginning the *Commentary on John* while the latter means that he will begin his commentary enterprise with the Gospel of John. The second translation suggests that the *Gospel of John* was the first exegetical work written by Cyril. Charlier gave special attention to the introduction of the Johannine commentary. He considered it an introduction to all of Cyril's exegetical scriptural writings, not only that of *John's Gospel*. When comparing the more fundamental character of the introduction and how it considers scriptures in general it can be easily suggested that this is a general introduction in comparison to other commentary books where the prologue is particular to the text being examined. Another important observation is that Cyril does not like repeating his explanation. In the Johannine Commentary Cyril writes a long exposition on the "manna."[203] He writes this excursus without any reference to the *Glaphyra* which indicates that the latter was not yet composed.[204] Based on these internal evidences it can be safely concluded that *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* was the first exegetical work that Cyril composed.[205] Finally, Jouassard insisted that it was impossible for Cyril to compose any work during the lifetime of Theophilus and thus the earliest that Cyril could possibly compose a work would be in 412.[206] Liebaert footnoted the first paragraph of his book and commented that it was very possible that Cyril began his literary activity before his episcopal years.[207] It is to this point that we must now turn our attention.

As discussed previously, Cyril must have followed the conventional educational system available at his time and finished his primary, secondary,

---

[202] *In Jo.* 1.7

[203] *In Jo.* 1.457–470.

[204] Charlier, *Thesaurus*, 60–61.

[205] Though Charlier and Liebaert conclusively abated Jouassard's argument about the composition of John's commentary in 425, the latter, twenty-seven years later, wrote an article, without any further evidence, and insists that he still holds his position regarding the 425 date. G. Jouassard, "La date des écrits antiariens de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue Bénédictine* 87, 1977 Maredsous (1977): 172–178.

[206] Jouassard, *Activité*, 170–171.

[207] J. Liebaert, *La doctrine christologique de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1951), 11.

and rhetoric schooling, thus completing his education, at most, by the age of twenty-one. By that age, he received his secular education through private tutoring in the patriarchate and his religious education in the Nitrean desert. He was appointed to be a reader "in" and "of" the patriarchal residence. Reading correctly the *lectio continua* involved a constant process of interpretation. Therefore, Cyril as a reader of the patriarchal residence had to delve at an early age, starting from the time when he was in the Nitrean desert, to interpret scripture. Scriptural interpretation was truly his passion. This is evident from the list of works collected in the first seven and a half volumes of the Migne and before the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy. Most probably, it was the Nesotrian controversy that interrupted his exegetical work and prevented him from accomplishing a complete exegesis of all the scripture. Until very recently, it was thought that Cyril did not write exegetical works for the Major Prophets, except Isaiah, until the discovery of one Armenian text for the interpretation of Ezekiel.[208] It is clear that Cyril focused especially on biblical interpretation, even though these biblical expositions were primarily geared towards dogmatic interpretation as in the example of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. For the sixteen years following the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy we know that he wrote treatises that comprised two and a half volumes of the Migne together with Homilies on the Gospel of Luke preserved in Syriac. It was thus impossible for Cyril to write seven and a half volumes of the Migne in the first sixteen years of his episcopacy [from A.D. 412 to 428], including the extensive management of such a large church as that of Alexandria. Most probably, after accompanying his uncle Theophilus to the Synod of the Oaks in A.D. 403, Cyril began to think seriously about putting his thoughts in writing. He had enough experience by that time, gained confidence when he accompanied his uncle to such an important event, and through his daily reader's duties began to write his exegetical writings. His residency in the patriarchate likely facilitated such an activity. Cyril's exegetical writings must have been guided by the following process.

Prolific writers, such as Origen and Augustine, used dictation as their means of composition. Eusebius describes the procedure as follows, "From this time, however, Origen began his commentaries on the sacred Scriptures, to which he was particularly urged by Ambrose who presented innumerable incentives, not only by verbal exhortations but by furnishing the most ample supplies of all necessary means, for he had more than seven

[208] In Jouassard, *Activité*, 162, n.2.

secretaries when he dictated, who relieved each other at appointed times. He had not fewer copyists, as also girls, who were well-exercised in more elegant writing."[209] Augustine wrote in *Ep.* 174, written in A.D. 416 to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, "…Since my plan could not be carried out on account of the persons who got access to the books before I wished, I discontinued my interrupted dictation, thinking to make a complaint about this in some of my other writings, so that those who could might know that those books had not been published by me but filched from me before I thought them worthy of being published in my name."[210] These two prolific writers could not have been able to achieve their enormous output had they not followed the dictation method while composing their works. Though Cyril never mentioned that he used copyists or shorthand secretaries to assist him in his writing, we know from both Origen and Augustine that prolific writers could not have achieved this output without such help. Therefore, we can reasonably assume that Cyril too was aided by secretaries in the output of his work. Knowing that the patriarchal residence could provide such assistance, Cyril must have made good use of it.

Publication, as we can deduce from the previous two quotes, was private. Gamble describes the process as follows,

> Authors who wished to make their work public had several ways to do so. They might make or have made at their own expense, several copies of an initial draft, which they would then distribute to friends. This alone did not amount to publication but constituted what we might think of as a referee procedure: the author expected a private reading and response from the recipients, with a view to revising and improving the work. Alternatively, they might invite a small group of friends to a reading (*recitatio*), at which the work, or parts of it, would be read by the author and discussed by the gathered company. In these ways an author made his work known, but only to a small and sympathetic circle of acquaintances. The work remained essentially private, under the author's direct control, and was still subject to revision.[211]

Cyril was in an optimal milieu for such an extensive procedure to take place. As a reader he developed his exegetical thought. He put his ideas into words with the help of the resources present in the patriarchate. After composition, he read extracts from his work to interested visitors who

---

[209] Eusebius *H.E.* 6.23.1–2. PG 20.576. *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*, trans. C. F. Cruse (MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 213.

[210] In Gamble, 133. Augustine *Ep.* 174. PL 33.758.

[211] Gamble, 83–4.

constituted the inner circle of acquaintances. They were his critics, his audience, and his supporters. This is supported by Severus' comment that after his return from Nitrea, "…and there Cyril dwelt with the patriarch in his cell, and read aloud in his presence; and the priests and learned men and philosophers were astonished at him,…."[212] Cyril always had the resources and environment that facilitated and encouraged him to write beginning in his early years. As to publication, this might have begun after he resided on the episcopal seat. His fame and prominence as the pope of Alexandria could be the reason for demand of copies of his work, or maybe it was even after the Nestorian controversy that his works began to be more sought after than ever.

Conclusion

Cyril was born of a family from Memphis, Upper Egypt. His mother, together with her brother Theophilus, left Upper Egypt, after the death of their parents, and headed north to Alexandria. On their arrival to the great city of Alexandria, they visited the patriarchal residence where Athanasius, who was pope at that time, took interest in Theophilus and his sister and became their benefactor. Theophilus' sister, the mother of Cyril, moved to Mahalle in the Delta region where she got married. She gave birth to Cyril in 378. In 385, when Cyril was seven, Theophilus became pope of Alexandria and following the example of his benefactor Athanasius, brought Cyril to Alexandria and oversaw his education in the patriarchal residence. At the age of fourteen Cyril finished his primary education and proceeded to the secondary level. At the age of seventeen Theophilus decided to send his nephew to the Nitrean desert in order to continue his education in spirituality, scripture, and morality, where the latter was considered part of the main stream educational system of the time. Cyril dwelt in the desert for five years under the guidance of Serapion the Wise absorbing the desert spirituality from his teacher as well as from the other great teachers and monastics of the time such as Macarius and Abba Joseph. His relationship with the monks never dwindled, for when the Nestorian controversy erupted, the monks were the first to receive a letter concerning the situation of the church. When the tranquility of the desert was disrupted by the Origenist controversy in 400, Theophilus summoned Cyril to Alexandria.[213] At the age of twenty-one, Cyril resumed his

[212] PO, 428.

[213] Tranquility does not mean the absence of noise around the vicinity of monastic dwellings. Gleason gives an interesting description of the Egyptian desert

education in rhetoric for a year, or a maximum of two. Shortly after Cyril arrived in Alexandria, Theophilus appointed him to the order of ἀναγνώστης or reader. His position as reader included reading scriptural texts during the liturgical services as well as reading in the patriarchal residence to those who came to visit. Reading was a complicated process, because the reader had to prepare the reading before hand by deciphering *lectio continua* and this in its own terms involved interpretation. Reading was considered a matter of interpretation. The process involved dedicated study from Cyril. When he proved fit, he was appointed as reader-teacher. A reader in the rank of δίδασκάλος assigned to be a "Gospel-exegete." This position gave Cyril the opportunity to pursue his scriptural exegetical interests. His presence in the patriarchal residence gave him the use of many of its resources. He made use of the patriarchal library, benefited from the presence of the grammarians and rhetors overseeing the patriarchal correspondence and administrative affairs, and benefited from the clergy, philosophers, and scholars who frequently visited the patriarch. He occasionally attended lectures by scholars who either resided or visited the School of Alexandria. Cyril was living in the cultural center of the world. He had many opportunities and resources to nourish his education and intellect. In 403, at the age of twenty-five, he accompanied his uncle Theophilus to the Synod of the Oaks. This is the first official public appearance of which we are aware, where Cyril was officially the secretary of Theophilus.

His position as reader-teacher helped Cyril to gradually develop his interest in exegesis. He began putting his ideas in writing by year 406 beginning with the *Thesaurus* and *De Trinitate* followed immediately by *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. These three texts were his very early writings. His love for the Bible culminated in a lengthy list of commentaries of most of the books of the Old Testament and the New Testament. Even after his ascendancy to the episcopacy, he continued his exegetical writings accompanied by the yearly Paschal Letters. His exegetical enterprise was

---

as a "busy place." By "busy" she means the visits of "uninvited guests, colleagues, potential disciples, clergy and lay visitors." These visits included the exchange of news as well as gossip. Maud Gleason, "Visiting and News: Gossip and Reputation-Management in the Desert," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6:3 (Fall 1998): 502. Therefore, what is meant by tranquility is when the activity of the desert reaches a disturbing level as in the case of the Origenist controversy. During that time monks had to choose sides, had to make statements of loyalty to opposing parties, and had to prove their orthodoxy. When politics overtakes the lives of the residents of the desert then we can say, that the tranquillity of the desert is disrupted.

interrupted in 428 by the Nestorian controversy; otherwise, he would have continued his commentaries on the Major Prophets. The Nestorian controversy consumed Cyril's mind and activities and his writings reflected this. After 428, Cyril's work was devoted to polemical writings. His interest in exegesis never abated. His sermons on the Gospel of Luke that were delivered during his episcopacy combine his love for exegesis and his preoccupation with the Nestorian controversy. He never seemed to find time to write a commentary, but only to deliver it in homiletic style. In 444, at the age of sixty-six, Cyril died leaving behind a huge amount of literature for the following generations to ponder.

CHAPTER 2

THE TRINITY

Saint Cyril wrote *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* with the intention of defending the faith against the false opinions (ψευδοδοξίαις) of other teachers (ἑτεροδιδασκαλούτων). Conscious of this aim, he decided to write his commentary with a special focus on dogmatic issues; thus, he specified his exposition as a "dogmatic exegesis" (δογματικωτέραν ... ἐξήγησιν).[214] Consequently, the Prologue of John was a truly fertile place to launch a detailed and long exposition of heretical teachings, one after the other; for instance, the first verse of the Gospel took the first three chapters of Book One to explicate. Throughout the commentary his focus never failed to respond to a heresy when deemed appropriate. Nonetheless, the heresy that most captured the attention of Cyril was that of Arius.[215] It will be noticed that most dogmatic explanations emphasize, over and over again, the divinity of the Son, the equality and unity of essence between the Son and the Father, the fact that the Son is eternal, the unchangeable divine essence, and the remaining doctrines that are directly threatened by Arian teachings. Having this in mind, the commentary is still a very good place to begin investigating the theology that Cyril embraced, because, while asserting the orthodox doctrine against that of the Arians, the Biblical text gives him a great opportunity to also speak about countless other topics.

---

[214] *In Jo.* 1.7. Kannengiesser is of the opinion that St. Athanasius is the "inventor of what one can call the 'dogmatic exegesis' which became one of the principal forms of biblical interpretation throughout the great controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries." Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria and the foundation of traditional Christology," in *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians* (Great Britain: Variorum, 1991), 110.

[215] Apart from Arius, the catalogue of heresy includes, Origen, Eunomius, the dualism of the Antiochenes (without specifying any names), Sabellius, and a special attention to the Jews.

Cyril's theology is very much within the Alexandrian tradition. The Church of Alexandria produced some prominent figures that shaped its thinking and influenced the thinking of the catholic church. The most famous were Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, and Didymus the Blind. There are other writers whose literary works were not given the same fame. For example, Dionysius of Alexandria, Peter of Alexandria, Alexander of Alexandria, and Theophilus—Cyril's uncle. This second group of writers has not received much attention from researchers and therefore, we cannot fully assess the impact of their writing on Alexandrian theology. As to the first group we can glean some common aspects among them. Clement of Alexandria set the tone of extensive use of biblical quotes when he alluded to 1500 passages in the Old Testament and 2000 in the New Testament. He also quoted 360 passages from the classics.[216] He placed classical education at the service of Christian doctrine. He set some standards for Christian writing, standards that were necessary for it to achieve any chance of recognition in the pagan world. Origen followed with his leading role in Biblical commentaries. He also pioneered in Biblical textual criticism when he put the Hexapla together. The Church of Alexandria also produced St. Athanasius. Quasten writes that Athanasius' "knowledge of Scripture, his skill in debate and the depth of his conviction have gained the admiration of succeeding generations."[217] Didymus the Blind, the last known head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, was reported by Palladius to have "interpreted the Old and the New Testament word by word, and such attention did he pay to the doctrine, setting out the exposition of it subtly yet surely, that he surpassed all the ancients in knowledge."[218] Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, and Didymus the Blind all focused on scripture, either to write commentaries, or to quote from it extensively, that led later scholars to notice and comment on this phenomena. The focus on scripture was a trait found throughout Alexandrian theology.

Alexandrian theology is primarily a Biblical theology. By Biblical theology we mean a theology that uses Biblical terms, is based on Biblical verses, and uses ideas and references directly quoted from or alluding to the Bible. The commentary is an exposition that is not based on systematic theology, since most arguments are not conducted on a philosophical basis. Therefore, a Biblical exegetical text written to address dogmatic issues is an

---

[216] Quasten, *Patrology*, 2.6.
[217] Ibid., 3.23.
[218] Ibid., 3.86.

extremely good place to begin investigating the theology of its writer. We can even argue that such a text could be a very good representation of Cyril's theology because of the vast number of topics and issues that a Gospel text covers. In addition, the exegesis of the fourth Gospel is most suited for such investigation because of the Gospel's theological focus. Furthermore, the commentary was written before the Nestorian controversy and thus reveals the theology of Cyril before the heated Nestorian debate. Most of the scholarly work connected to Cyril focused on the post-Nestorian texts, especially the texts that deal directly with the issue of the debate.[219]

A theological study of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* is certainly extremely significant. The commentary is almost intact except for two books, books seven and eight, that have been collected from fragments and catenae. Therefore, the possibility of interpolations into the text is reduced to a minimum. The commentary is thoroughly comprehensive in its subject which gives one a broader view of Cyril's theology, amending the excessive scholarly focus on his Christology at the expense of the larger Trinitarian picture. The intent of the study is to put the theology of Cyril within perspective of other topics that were not discussed in other studies. For example, subjects such as the Trinity, will and free choice, heretical dogmas, the Gospel message and spirituality, the newness of life, teachers and teaching in the church, and many other topics. Since each of the topics just mentioned is a research project of its own, this chapter will be confined to the study of the Trinity.

This chapter will begin by highlighting the theological background that guided Cyril in his theological undertaking. Following this is a clarification of what Cyril means by the terms "God" and "Trinity," then we will discuss each person of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The interrelationship that guides and binds the activity of each person of the Trinity will then be explored. Finally, the research will examine the oneness of the Trinity and how it is directly related to understanding the oneness of Christ.[220]

---

[219] For example, there is no known study that discusses the homilies delivered on the Gospel of Luke after the Nestorian debate. Scholars have focused primarily on Nestorian polemical texts.

[220] Brian Daley pointedly writes at the opening paragraph of his article that "One of the strange twists of modern Patristic studies is the lack of attention paid by scholars to Cyril of Alexandria's theology of the Trinity, despite the relatively large place that Mystery occupies in the bulk of his writing. The reason, of course, is that the study of early Christian theology in both East and West, since the time of

Theological background

As discussed in the previous chapter, Jerome shared mutual correspondence with Theophilus and this raised the question among some scholars concerning Cyril's acquaintance with the literary products of Jerome. In addition, we know that Cyril was aware of the writings of Didymus the Blind, since both belonged to the same school of thought. Liébaert, in a detailed study of Cyril's *Thesaurus* and after comparing the method of argumentation, style, and vocabulary, concluded that Cyril most probably used Didymus' *Adversus Eunomium IV-V*.[221] However, what Liébaert was most certain about is that, while writing the *Thesaurus*, Cyril entirely reworked Athanasius' *Contra Arianos*. Cyril added some personal touches to the Athanasian work but, as a whole, the personal additions are rather slim. This opinion was based on a detailed comparison of the two texts, the *Thesaurus* and *Contra Arianos*.[222] Liébaert also concluded that Cyril did not borrow from Basil, or Gregory of Nyssa, or Epiphanius. It is quite striking that Cyril's sources were without exception Alexandrian. Apart from the influence of Athanasius, Didymus the Blind is possibly the only other source for Cyril's *Thesaurus*.[223]

Cyril did not deny the impact of St. Athanasius on his thought and repeatedly mentioned Athanasius in his correspondence. Cyril referred to Athanasius eighteen times in his letters. A certain priest by the name of Alypius compared the struggle of Cyril to keep the faith during the Council of Ephesus to "the martyrdom of the thrice-blessed Athanasius" (τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ τρισμακαρίου Ἀθανασίου).[224] Cyril himself repeatedly

---

the Reformation at least, has been dominated by *Dogmengeschichte*: by the investigation of how the classic shape of Christian orthodoxy developed, in the controversies and arguments that paved the way for the creeds, canons, and conciliar definitions accepted as normative by the mainstream Christian churches." Brian Daley, *The Fullness of the Saving God: Cyril of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit*, in *Theology of Cyril of Alexandria*, ed. Thomas Weinandy and Daniel Keating (New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 113.

[221] J. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1951), 56–63.

[222] Ibid., 63–4. The comparison between both texts, the *Thesaurus* and *Contra Arianos* is summarized into two tables in Ibid., 24, 25–27.

[223] Ibid., 63.

[224] *ACO* 1.1.3 74,3. Even during his lifetime, Cyril was already compared to his predecessor in many ways. He was even called the "son of Athanasius." (fils d'Athansase), quoted in H. Du Manoir, *Dogme et Spiritualité chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris: L. Vrin, 1944), 18.

referred to Athanasius as "my father." This is how Cyril describes Athanasius in his first letter to the monks: "In any event, our father Athanasius, of hallowed memory, adorned the throne of the Church of Alexandria for the whole of forty-six years and arrayed an unconquerable and apostolic knowledge in battle against the sophistries of the unholy heretics and greatly gladdened the world by his writings as by a most fragrant perfume and all bear witness to the accuracy and piety of his teaching."[225] Cyril's understanding that his predecessor had an "apostolic knowledge" and that his writings were accurate and the product of piety and describing the writings as "most fragrant perfume" just indicates to what extent Cyril held the writing of Athanasius in his heart. Cyril even acknowledged that he does not depart from his father's writings: "That we follow the doctrines of the holy Fathers in all ways, and especially of our blessed and all-glorious father, Athanasius, praying earnestly not to depart from him in anything at all." Cyril had a copy of all of Athanasius' works and when "some have published a corrupt text of the letter of our all-glorious father, Athanasius," Cyril was aware of the corruption and alerted Epictetus to the interpolation.[226] Cyril also considered Athanasius as a confessor of the faith when he addressed him as "the most holy and most blessed Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria and confessor."[227]

Since Cyril's *Thesaurus* depended primarily on Athanasius' *Contra Arianos*, and because *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* is also a work against Arius, we need to understand the basic Athanasian theological framework by which Cyril was influenced. Athanasius was the champion that confronted Arius, instrumental in formulating the Nicean Creed, a bishop of the Church of Alexandria, and the benefactor of Theophilus. All of the previously-mentioned points can only affirm the direct and indirect influence Athanasius exerted on Cyril. It should be emphasized that this is not a comparative study of Cyril and Athanasius nor is it meant to affirm the influence of Athanasius on Cyril; rather, reference to Athanasius will be used to explain the framework within which Cyril operated. Thus, we will proceed with presenting the main framework of Athanasius' *On the Incarnation*, as this work represents a summary of the author's theology and we can consider it some sort of an Athanasian manifesto.

---

[225] *ACO* 1.1.1 p10–23. CPG 5301. McEnerney, 76.15.

[226] *ACO* 1.1.5 p15–20. CPG 5339. McEnerney 76.151–2.

[227] *ACO* 1.1.7 p146; McEnerney 77.183. In addition, Cyril called him "the thrice blessed" or "the blessed and noble." Ibid., 76:117; 76:166; 77:57; 77:66; 77:185. Cyril also called Athanasius, "the most pious bishop" and in the same letter he also called him "the most God-fearing bishop." Ibid., 77.2,4; 77:92–3.

On the Incarnation begins with the story of the creation and fall. God created the world through the Word. God also created the universe out of nothing and created man after his own image, the image of the Word. His own image entailed having a portion of the power of the Word, and being endowed with reason that would enable them to live in everlasting happiness.[228] God created man with a free will, knowing that man could choose good or evil. In anticipation of man's ability to sway to either side God guarded man in the garden and gave man the law. If our first parents keep the commandments, they keep the life of eternal incorruption in heaven. On the other hand, if they transgress, they suffer corruption by death. Transgression made humans return to their original state—they came out of nothing and after the transgression they returned to nothing. God's goodness could not let man go to waste and suffer corruption and death. Only through the Word, in whose image we were created and through whom the world came to be, can corruption and death be overcome. For this purpose the incorruptible, incorporeal, and immaterial Word of God becomes incarnate. He takes a real body like ours from a virgin. By that he would turn men towards incorruption and abolish death by his resurrection. Corruption cannot be overcome except by death. Since the Son cannot suffer death, the incarnation was the only means by which the Son would have a human body that suffers death. He died on behalf of humanity and satisfied the debt of death incurred by the transgression. Now, we die awaiting the general resurrection instead of being subject to condemnation.

The Word did not suffer any change when he became Incarnate. When he was "circumscribed in the body" he was not absent elsewhere, nor when he was active in the body was the "universe left void of His working and Providence."[229] The Incarnate Word did things as man and God. When Gospel writers "speak of Him as eating and drinking and being born, they mean that the body, as a body, was born and sustained with the food proper to his nature; while God the Word, who was united with it, was at the same time ordering the universe and revealing Himself through His bodily acts as not man only but God. Those acts are rightly said to be His acts, because the Body which did them did indeed belong to Him and none other; moreover, it was right that they should be thus attributed to Him as Man, in order to show that His body was a real one and not merely an

[228] Athanasius, *de incarnatione* 3 (PG 25.101).
[229] Athanasius, *de incarnatione* 17 (PG 25.125).

appearance."[230] Therefore, according to Athanasius, the works belonging to the body prove the reality of the incarnation and oppose all docetic accusations. On the other hand, divine works are to affirm his divinity. His works manifested him as God and man. Since our salvation requires the two components, the divine and the human, the Incarnate Word had to manifest the presence of both components within him at all times through his works. The Son of God is "living and active."[231] He took a body and appropriated it "as His own." So, it is impossible for the body to remain dead, because it has become the "temple of life."[232] The body "died as mortal, but lived again because of the life within it; and its resurrection is made known through its works."[233]

The conclusion of Athansius' treatise is summed in his famous phrase, "For He was made man that we might be made god (θεοποιηθῶμεν)."[234] This statement summarizes the main aim of the incarnation according to Athanasius and the Alexandrian fathers who preceded and followed him. The salvific act of the Word had to ensure overcoming death and incorruptibility and thus restore man to the original image of God. This act requires the Word who is the creator, and only the creator can restore his creation. "That we might be made God" is the act of restoring creation. Therefore, when Arius proposed the idea that the Word is not fully divine, Athanasius could not accept this because his point was that without the presence of the full divinity in the Incarnate Word the ability of restoration is reduced to nil. By the same token, when Nestorius suggested that the humanity assumed is not that of the Word but assumed by grace Cyril saw a great threat to the theme of salvation. The Incarnate Word must take humanity "as His own" so that through it He is able to restore the divine image. If the humanity is not "His own" how will the Word restore creation? The image presented by Athanasius in *On the Incarnation of the Word* is the crucial thesis by which all the church adjusted her orthodoxy. This

---

[230] Athanasius, *de incarnatione* 18. St. Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, trans. & ed. by a Religious of C.S.M.V (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 46.

[231]Athanasius, *de incarnatione* 31 (PG 25. 149).

[232] Ibid.

[233] Ibid.

[234] Athanasius, *de incarnatione* 54 (PG 25.192). For studies on the "divinization" in the Early Church refer to J. Gorss, *The Divinization of the Christian according to the Greek Fathers*, trans. Paul A. Onica (Anaheim, California: A&C Press, 2002). Johan Leemans, "*God became Human in order that Humans might become God": A Reflection on the Soteriological Doctrine of Divinization* (Leuven: University Press, Peeters, 2000).

main framework was the guiding pattern of Cyril. Any theological innovation that would jeopardize this scheme of salvation had to be conformed with Athanasius' treatise, *Contra Arianus*, must also be understood on the basis of ideas expressed in *On the Incarnation*. Thus, during the study of Cyril's work we cannot avoid referring to this Athanasian main theme when suitable. This explains why Cyril had difficulty in accepting or refuting some ideas. If the ideas presented by anyone do not conform to this scheme they are usually labeled "false opinions" (ψευδοδοξίαις).[235] Moreover, for Cyril, they had to be opposed resulting in the product of this exegetical work.

God

Cyril explained that for someone to claim that he believes in God, this belief should be in God the Father, the Son, the Son who became incarnate, and the Holy Spirit.[236] According to Cyril, if one was satisfied with the faith in "God" and that this one word is sufficient to encompass this faith, then their faith is that of Judaism. But the faith, that is, the faith of the Christians, should indicate the acceptance of the name of the Son (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Υἱοῦ) and thus include the acceptance of the evangelical preaching (κηρυγμάτων εὐαγγελικῶν).[237] Believing in the Son alone is not sufficient; in addition to the name it must entail the belief in His incarnation and in the Holy Spirit.

Cyril wrote this with a clear intention to refute the Jewish understanding of God that does not include the three persons of the Trinity. Though the argument is formed with an apologetic intent, it reveals how Christians are supposed to define and understand their triune God. Christians should have a faith that believes in the holy and consubstantial Trinity (ἁγία καὶ ὁμοούσιος Τριὰς) where each person of the Trinity differs in name (ταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων διαφοραῖς) and quality of persons (τῶν προσώπων ποιότησί) and each person has a distinct or separate property (ἰδιότησι διαστέλλεται).[238] Cyril explained further what he meant

---

[235] *In Jo* 1.7.

[236] δεῖ γὰρ πιστεύειν τοὺς οἵ γε φρονοῦσιν ὀρθῶς, εἷς γε Θεὸν Πατέρα, καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἰς Υἱὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα; καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ῎Αγιον. *In Jo.* 2.401.

[237] Ibid.

[238] Ibid. At this point of the argument, Cyril focused on the differing names of the Trinity, and did not qualify what he meant by the "quality of persons" nor distinguished property. In other parts of his commentary, as will be discussed

by differing names of the Trinity. He wrote that the Father is not the Son, nor is the Son the Father. Also the Holy Spirit belongs to the Godhead (ἴδιον τῆς θεότητος).[239] Although Cyril clearly emphasized each person of the Trinity, he repeatedly insisted that he was speaking about only one God (ἕνα Θεὸν). Cyril repeated himself again—as he usually did to affirm his point—that it is not sufficient to affirm our faith by the simple statement "We believe in God," (Πιστεύομεν εἰς Θεὸν) rather we must explicitly say that we believe in every person of the Trinity and attribute the same glory to each person (ἑκάστῳ προσώπῳ τὸν αὐτὸν τῆς δόξης). Giving equal glory to each person of the Trinity affirms our faith in the equality of each person and that we confess equally each of the three persons and attribute equal faith to each person. Nevertheless, this insistence on distinction is accompanied by a unity of nature (ἑνότητα φύσεως) of the Trinity. Distinction is accompanied by unity in one and the same thought. Once Cyril asserted the unity of the Trinity, the argument is instantly followed by pointing to the unity of the Son for there is only *One Lord Jesus Christ* (1 Cor 8:6).[240] For Cyril, if we sever the two natures of the Incarnate Word then we are separating the flesh from the Word and speak of two sons. He who believes in the two sons then believes only in the flesh (γινωσκέτω πιστεύειν εἰς μόνην τὴν σάρκα).[241] Cyril found it very important to insist that Christians must understand that the belief in one God must also entail the belief in the Trinity, while at the same time keeping the unity of the Trinity and affirming the One God.

Cyril explained that fully knowing that God is the origin and creator of the universe is not sufficient. For knowing that God is only God (τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰδέναι μόνον Θεὸν ὄντα τὸν θεὸν) does not differ much and distinguish us from the Jewish belief in God.[242] Christians do have

---

further on, he explained the different activity of each person of the Trinity to signify the separate property.

[239] Ibid.

[240] All scriptural quotes are from the NRSV unless otherwise noted.

[241] *In Jo.* 2.402.

[242] *In Jo.* 2.682. Such comments raised questions about Jewish polemics in the writings of Cyril. This exegetical work is a dogmatic exegetical work and Cyril is defending the Christian faith against all those who have differing opinions. This includes the Jews. Sensitivity towards Jewish issues has surfaced only in the last century and we should not project our modern opinions shaped by recent historical events on writings that were written centuries earlier in a very different social and political setting. Wilken addressed this issue in a brief discussion of Jewish-Christian relations especially in Alexandria during the first five centuries of the

knowledge of God that exceeds that of the Jews. This belief should affirm that he is Father (ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καὶ Πατὴρ) and the Father of the Son. In addition, we have to clearly affirm that the Holy Spirit is one of the Trinity. For Cyril to believe that God is creator is directly connected with the Trinity for *Let us make humankind in our image according to our likeness* (Gen 1:26) signifies the Holy Trinity (ἡ ἁγία Τριὰς σημαίνεται).[243] Cyril acknowledged that the Jews (the men of ancient times, τοῖς ἀρχαιοτέροις) had a difficult time understanding this, for neither was the Father named nor was the Son manifest.[244] However, the Son gave us the Father's name (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς) and brought us to perfect knowledge of himself when he said, *I have made your name known to those whom you gave me from the world* (Jn 17:6).[245]

The Son did not only reveal the Father to the world he also added and changed the Law. God established his commandments when he handed them down to Moses. The Law was strict and straightforward, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*. Nevertheless, we find Christ has the authority to add, *but I say unto you* that you shall not covet. Cyril asserted that no one has ever added or changed the word of God. Only Christ maintained the authority to say, *but I say unto you*. Cyril explained that what Christ is really doing is changing the type into truth (ὁ Χριστὸς μετατιθεὶς τὰ ἐν τύποις εἰς ἀλήθιαν).[246] Therefore, Christ is not under the Law but rather a promulgator of the Law. Furthermore, Christ makes his own word that of the Father (ἴδιον οὖν ἄρα λόγον τὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐποιήσατο Χριστός).[247] Since this is the case, the Word is in the Father and proclaims (ἐξαγγελτικός) the will of the Godhead (τῶν τῆς θεότητος θελημάτων). Then Cyril proceeded to the logical conclusion of his argument: if the Son and the Word proclaims the will of the Godhead and promulgates the Law, then he is indeed one with the Godhead. He proceeded on to give a clear definition concerning what is the only true Godhead, it is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (θεότητος δέ φημι τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ μόνης, ἡ ἐν Πατρί τε καὶ Υἱῷ νοεῖται καὶ Αγίῳ Πνεύματι).[248] Cyril again asserted that when

---

Church. R. L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind. A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971), 1–68.

[243] *In Jo.* 2.682.

[244] Ibid.

[245] Ibid.

[246] *In Jo.* 2.712.

[247] Ibid.

[248] Ibid.

he speaks about God he is really speaking about the Trinity. This quote was not to make a polemical point against the Jews. He was asserting that the God he is speaking about has to constantly include the image of the Trinity, or else how can Cyril speak about the Word and the Holy Spirit if they are not part of the Godhead.

Cyril offered an example of how to distinguish between οὐσία and φύσις to establish that the Father and the Son are of the same nature. He explained the difference in the following way. There are two persons, with the assumed names of Paul and Silvanus, who have different levels of knowledge of the mystery of Christ. If we suppose that Paul has been fully instructed in the mystery of Christ (πεπαιδεύσθω τελείως τὸ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ μυστρήριον) and Silvanus has lesser knowledge than that of Paul, does this mean that they are not alike in nature (φύσιν) or that the essence (οὐσίας) of Paul surpasses that of Silvanus?[249] No. Cyril did not accept the notion that Paul and Silvanus are of different nature or essence because of their divergent level of knowledge of the mystery of Christ. Having scrutinized the matter according to his satisfaction, Cyril concludes that essence (οὐσίας) is not defined according to its level of knowledge, whether of learning or teaching. Consequently, the nature of the Son is not affected if he says that *I speak these things as the Father instructed me* (Jn 8:28). Therefore, it is not wrong to say that the Son is by nature God (οὐδὲν ἀδικήσει τὸν Υἱὸν εἰς τὸ εἶναι κατὰ φύσιν Θεὸν) and will be of the same essence (τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοουσιότητος) as the Father.[250] The importance of this example is that the nature (φύσις) of God is not defined according to its properties as having knowledge or lack of it. Neither is the nature of the Son defined according to the properties of his person. The nature of God is different from his essence (οὐσία) and we cannot use essence to define nature. To speak about God is to speak about God's nature and for this Cyril had to compare it with the Son's nature. To speak about God is to speak about the Son and to speak about the Son is to speak about the Trinity.

The Only-Begotten follows the laws of his own nature (ἀλλ᾽ ὡς φύσεως ἰδίας θεσμοῖς ἀκολουθῶν).[251] Moreover, the laws of his nature are the same as that of the nature of God. Therefore, since both have the same nature, the congruence of the behavior of the Son with that of the Father must exist because how could the consubstantial and one Godhead ever be

[249] *In Jo.* 2.49–50.
[250] Ibid.
[251] *In Jo.* 2.52.

in disagreement with itself? (πῶς γὰρ ἄν ὅλως ἡ ὁμοούσιὸς τε καὶ μία θεότης αὕτη καθ᾽ ἑαυτῆς διχονοήσαι ποτέ;)[252] Cyril proceeded to explain that God the Father exists properly of his own by himself (ὑφέστηκεν ἰδίᾳ), as do the Son and the Holy Spirit. Yet the Trinity is not divided and the one nature of the Godhead comes to its complete fullness in unity.[253] Again, when Cyril discussed the Godhead and the nature of the Godhead, he specifically highlighted the existence of each person of the Trinity and their unity identifies the Godhead. For even if each person of the Trinity exists on its own, they are not at variance in will or nature.

Speaking about God is speaking about the Trinity. When Cyril used the term θεός he had in mind the three persons of the Trinity. Therefore, as an extension of what it is to speak about God, we have to examine what Cyril wrote about the Trinity.

Trinity

This section will inquire into the notion of the Trinity in Cyril's commentary. The Trinity is the main theological idea within which Cyril, together with other early church writers, based their arguments. In Cyril's writings, this framework is expressed in the following Trinitarian formula: All things are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. This formula expresses the activity within the Trinity and the relationship between each person within the Trinity.

Cyril assured his readers that believing in the Trinity is justifiable (δικαιούμεθα).[254] The Son himself ordered his disciples to preach the Gospel to the nations by telling them *Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* (Mt. 28:19).[255] Cyril argued that if having three different names for each person of the Trinity contributes nothing towards our thoughts and understanding (πρὸς νόησιν) then why is there any commandment for us believers to be baptized in the name of the Trinity rather than being baptized into unity (μὴ πρὸς ἑνάδα)?[256] Thus, the three persons have a genuinely special significance to our faith and each person of the Trinity

[252] Ibid.

[253] *In Jo.* 1.52–3.

[254] *In Jo.* 1.27.

[255] This verse has been traditionally used by the early fathers, following Basil's example in *On the Holy Spirit* (PG 32.67–217), to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Cyril approached the verse from a very different hermeneutical point of view and used it to validate the belief in the Trinity.

[256] *In Jo.* 1.28.

exists as a person on his own (ὡς ἐν ὑποστάσει μὲν ἰδιᾳ).[257] Since each person of the Trinity has the same nature and none of the natures of the divinity suffers change, we therefore have one Godhead and each person of the Trinity has the same and equal worship. Cyril mentioned the exact idea in very similar words when he commented on Jn 1:1 *And the Word was with God*. Cyril insisted that we should distinguish each person of the Trinity and acknowledge that each exists in their own person and not consider them as one and the same lest the difference be that of name only.[258]

Thus, believing in the Trinity is an integral part of our faith and this is expressed from the early stages of our entering the faith, that is, on the day of our baptism. If the existence of the Trinity does not contribute to our mental understanding of the Godhead, there is no need to call the Father "Father," the Son "Son," and the Holy Spirit "Holy Spirit." In this case, it is not for polemical reasons that we intellectually understand three persons, but because it contributes directly to our vision of what our faith is.

Commenting on Gen 19:24, *Then the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrah sulfur and fire from the Lord out of heaven*, Cyril pointed out that the verse alerts the reader to the presence of two Lords. One Lord sent the fire from heaven, therefore one is the sender. Another rained on Sodom and Gomorrah, the other accomplishes the command of sending the rain. It is clear that the Father works everything through the Son (ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ δι' Υἱοῦ πάντα ἐνεργῶν).[259] The explanation that Cyril provided clarifies that an activity—the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah—that involves the Father and the Son is bound by the relationship of "δια." The Father works διὰ "through" the Son. When Cyril expounded upon a verse that includes two or more persons of the Trinity, he attempted to clarify the relationship among the persons.

Cyril clarified when commenting on Jn 14:11, *then believe me because of the works themselves*, that the Son is not an instrument (ὄργανον) in the hands of the Father.[260] Cyril explained that there is a great difference between the way that Christ is in Paul and worked wonders through him and the works of Christ himself. The indwelling of God the Father in Christ is quite

---

[257] Ibid.

[258] *In Jo.* 1.17.

[259] *In Jo.* 1.28.

[260] Cyril is speaking here about the Son being used as an instrument in achieving the work of the Father. This is very different from the theological issue raised by modern scholars about the human nature of the Son used as an instrument by the divine nature. The issue of the human nature as an instrument will be considered when we discuss the "Son."

different from that of Christ in Paul. The Only Begotten is not a musical instrument in the hands of the Father nor a saw in the hands of a skillful carpenter. The Father does not work wonders (θαυματουργίαν) through the Son reducing him to a mere instrument and making the Son alien to the Father.[261] This is to clarify the διὰ relationship between the Father and the Only Begotten Son; it is not a relationship of instrumentality which would subsequently reduce the Son to an alien from the essence of the Father.[262] The Son is of the same essence as that of the Father and is truly Son. If he is not Son, then the Father is not Father and is not Father in truth (οὐκ ἔτι γὰρ ἔσται πατὴρ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὁ Πατήρ).[263] It will follow that the Holy Trinity is falsely named, if neither the Father is truly Father, nor the Son is Son by nature. It will also follow then, corresponding to this view, that there will be slander against the Holy Spirit.[264] Therefore, if we reduce the Son to an instrument, it will follow that he is a creature and thus not of the nature of the Father. Consequently he is not the Son of the Father and the Father is not truly Father. Furthermore, if we attack the Father this will affect the Holy Spirit. The result is that the whole idea of the Trinity will fall apart. Therefore, the Trinitarian thought was very much embedded in Cyril's mind and he always ensured that nothing would pull it asunder.

Each person of the Trinity sheds light on the nature of the Trinity. When Cyril expounded on Jn 8:19, *If you knew me, you would know my Father also* he wrote that it is possible to have the most accurate and full knowledge of the Father through the Son according to Psalm 139:6 where *such knowledge is too wonderful for me*. Thus, since we know the Son we know who begets him (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐπέγνωμεν τὸν Υἱὸν, ἐπέγνωμεν ἐξ οὐτοῦ τὸν γεννήσαντα).[265] Therefore, when we mention the Father the memory (μνήμη) of the Son is brought to our minds and the Son triggers the name of the one who begets him. Therefore, the Son is the door and way to the full knowledge (ἐπίγνωσιν) of the Father.[266] Subsequently, when we know what the Son is by nature, and him being an image (εἰκόνος) and an impress (χαρακτῆρος) of the Father we are able to know the archetype

---

[261] *In Jo.* 2.439.

[262] Ibid.

[263] *In Jo.* 2.440.

[264] ψευδώνυμος οὖν ἄρα παντελῶς ἡ ἁγία Τριὰς, μήτε τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν πατρὸς, μήτε μὴν υἱοῦ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ. ἀκολουθήσει δὲ ἀναλόγως τῷ θεωρήματι καὶ ἡ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δυσφημία. *In Jo.* 2.440.

[265] *In Jo.* 1.727.

[266] Ibid.

(ἀρχέτυπον).[267] Gradually, we attain an incontestable conception of the Holy Trinity.[268] Knowing one person of the Trinity leads us to know the other persons and the Trinity as the Godhead.[269]

Cyril asserted the same idea when he wrote that the persons of the Trinity are alike in all things in natural properties (τῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων).[270] If some heretical opinion suggests that there is a Son other than the Word, then the Holy Spirit will correspondingly have another one equal with him. In this case we have a duality in the Trinity. In other words, the Trinity has become double or twofold, and the divine nature is shown to be composite.[271] Therefore, any duality in any person of the Trinity will

---

[267] *In Jo.* 1.728.

[268] Ibid.

[269] Though we have demonstrated this notion from one example as illustrated in Cyril's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, this very same idea is the basis of his treatise *De sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate*. Cyril wrote an exposition on the Trinity in the form of dialogue. Cyril explained in his introduction to the text that he chose to write in dialogue genre because, as Quasten has elegantly rephrased Cyril's words, "the subtlety of the questions that he intends to answer demands the adoption of this form." Quasten, *Patrology*, 3.126. Regarding the topic of the Trinity, in his prologue, Cyril lists the contents of his seven dialogues. The first six concern the Son and the last and seventh concern the Holy Spirit. In the first six dialogues he discusses the Son being co-eternal (συναΐδιός) and consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father. He is also generated by nature (κατὰ φύσιν γεννητὸς) from the Father. The Son is truly God as the Father. The Son is not created or made. The divine properties (τὰ τῆς θεότητος ἴδια) of the Son are that of the Father. The human properties are of the Son after his economy and not when he was the Word. The last dialogue involves the Holy Spirit and is concerned to prove that the Holy Spirit is God and of God by nature (ὅτι καὶ Θεὸς καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν). *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Dialogues sur la Trinité*, edited and translated by G. M. De Durand. SC, vol. 231 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976), 128. In conclusion, when Cyril wanted to dedicate a treatise speaking about the Trinity, his approach is to speak about the properties and nature of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the method that Cyril uses to approach the Trinity is through discussing the properties and nature of each person of the Trinity demonstrated from the above example in the text of the commentary. This research will not proceed to investigate this idea in the dialogues, rather it will restrict the research to the text of the commentary. It is important to observe that Cyril focused his discussion in the dialogues as well as the commentary on issues that are threatened by the Arian controversy and, therefore, tries to assert the divinity of the Son, as well as that of the Holy Spirit.

[270] *In Jo.* 1.58.

[271] γέγονεν οὖν ἡμῖν ἡ Τριὰς ἐν διπλῷ, καὶ ἐν συνθέσει λοιπὸν θεία φαίνεται φύσις. *In Jo.* 1.58–9.

lead to a duality of the Trinity. To keep the Trinitarian system intact, Cyril must attribute to each person the same and exact properties in order to preserve the oneness and the unity of the Trinity.

In most cases Cyril summarized his discussion about the Trinity by a formula that clarifies the relationship of each person within the Trinity. He usually affirms or concludes his discussion with the statement "for all things are by the Father through the Son in the Spirit" (πάντα γὰρ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[272] Thus, we will proceed to follow the discussions that lead to this Cyrillian formula and understand the context in which he used it.

When commenting on Jn 17:23 *I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one*, Cyril used the verse to express the relationship between the Father and the Son, as well as that of the Trinity. Cyril began with the economy that has taken place for the salvation of our souls; that is, the starting point of his argument to expound this verse is the Incarnation. Cyril described the Word leaving his equality with God the Father following the theme of the second chapter of Philippians. Therefore, the Word stepped out of heaven leaving his glory and equality with the Father and emptied himself—He, who from old and before the beginning, is worshiped with the Father. Cyril implied, based on the Philippians text, that this worship included the flesh. The flesh that is earthly, perishable, and of human form, is intellectually of the Word's nature. This nature that is required by necessity is his own for he was in the form and equality with the Father.[273] When he took an earthly temple from the Virgin's womb, once and for all, it became represented (παραδεχθεὶς) as the body of the Word and thus became accounted as one with him.[274] For Christ is one, and the Son is one, even when he became man.[275] As a result, Cyril wrote that the Son, after his ascension, is in union with the Father, taking worship equal to that of the Father as based on Phil. 2:9–11. Even though the flesh is not of the Father's nature and does not enjoy union with God, it is one with the Word and is in union with the Father. Following this explanation, Cyril gives this

---

[272] To mention a few references: *In Jo.* 1.67–69; 1.126–128; 1.292–295; 1.537–539; 2.431–434; 2.534–541; 2.660–661; 3.2–3.

[273] ὁ πάλαι καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐνυπάρχων μετὰ Πατρὸς δέχεται τοῦτο μετὰ σαρκὸς, τοῦ γηΐνου τε καὶ ἐπικήρου περιβλήματος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας μορφῆς, τῇ ὡς ἐν λόγῳ φημὶ τῷ φυσικῷ νοουμένης, ἀπαιτούσης ἀναγκαίως, καθάπερ ἐν χάριτος μέρει, τὸ φύσει προσὸν αὐτῷ. ἦν γὰρ καὶ ἔστιν ἐν μορφῇ καὶ ἰσότητι τοῦ Πατρός. *In Jo.* 3.1–2.

[274] *In Jo.* 3.2.

[275] εἷς γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ εἷς Υἱὸς, καὶ ὅτε γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος. *In Jo.* 3.2.

brief concluding summation, "If one ought to speak more concisely and more clearly, the Only-Begotten says that what was given to him was given to his own flesh. Indeed, given totally by the Father, through himself, in the Spirit."[276] He then elaborated on this statement and further explained that in no other way can we have union with God except intellectually (νοοῖτο) through Christ when he manifested himself and became man. The union with the Spirit, which was a union without confusion with God the Word and in an inexpressible way, sanctified the flesh. Furthermore, through this union we are united with the Father permanently, albeit not in a physical way.

This elaborate exegesis of Jn 17:23 *I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one* leads us to the following conclusions. First, Cyril had in mind the Athanasian theme of salvation, where, God, in order to save humanity, had to send the Word and take flesh and become man, and through his incarnation he is able to lead humanity to deification. Therefore, Cyril followed the Philippian scheme of divine kenosis and lets the Word be united with flesh. He takes the earthly temple, once and for all, not only for the duration of his earthly ministry, but permanently, and takes humanity as his own and as part of his nature. With this permanent union, he receives worship and glory equal to that of the Father. Moreover, with this permanent union, he causes the sanctification and deification of humanity. Through our sanctified state we are united with the Father. Therefore, the Father has sanctified us and united us with him through his Son, and all this could not be done except in the Spirit. Clearly, for Cyril, the incarnation was the work of the Trinity and not simply one person.

Once again Cyril explained a verse where the relationship between the Father and the Son needs to be clarified. Jn 14:11 reads, *Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father is in me*. Cyril explained that there is nothing that intervenes and separates the one from the other into different natures. For he is consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with his own begetter and nothing can separate one from the other, for he is one in essence (οὐσίᾳ) with the Father.[277] To make himself clear, Cyril gave the example of the offspring of human beings. Our offspring are of the same human nature as ourselves though each is physically distinct from the other. In the case of humanity we evidently share a common essence and thus cling together only physically or draw together in a certain manner. However, each tends to go

[276] καὶ εἰ χρή τι συντομώτερον καὶ σαφέστερον εἰπεῖν, ἑαυτῷ δεδόσθαι φησὶν ὁ Μονογενὴς τὸ δοθὲν τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκί. δοθὲν δὲ δὴ πάντως παρὰ Πατρὸς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι. *In Jo.* 3.2.

[277] *In Jo.* 2.431.

their own different way and each withdraws to their own self.[278] Nevertheless, this is not the case with God. For the Father is personally a Father and not a Son. Similarly, he who comes of him is Son and not Father and the spirit is peculiarly Spirit.[279] Since the Holy Trinity is together and joined in one Godhead we therefore have one God.[280] Due to this unity, no one person of the Godhead will withdraw to itself as a human does. After Cyril explained how the Son proceeds from the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from God he concluded with his famous formula that sums up his understanding of the relationship among the Trinity by writing, "for all things are through the Son in the Holy Spirit" (πάντα γὰρ δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι᾽ Αγίῳ).[281] Cyril insisted on the individuality of each person of the Trinity. This individuality does not lead to withdrawal or separation as happens among human beings, but, because all things are through the Son in the Holy Spirit, the unity is preserved and the one Godhead is guarded. We have one God among us.

John the Evangelist writes in Jn 1:10, *and the world came into being through him* (καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγενετο). The verse is clear in asserting that the Word is the creator and not a creature and thus is of equal divinity with the Father.[282] The Son alone, as creator, has the power to reign over his creation and is thus equal to God.[283] However, most important of all *the world came into being through him*, makes us think of thought (ἔννοιαν) of the Father and leads us to know the "of whom" (ἐξ οὗ) and "through whom" (δι᾽ οὗ) in the process of creation. "For all things are by the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit" (πάντα γὰρ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν᾽ Αγίῳ

[278] Ibid.

[279] ἰδιαζόντως μὲν γὰρ πατήρ ἐστιν ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ οὐχ Υἱός. καὶ πάλιν ὁμοίως Υἱὸς ὁ ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ πατὴρ, καὶ πνεῦμα τὸ Πνεῦμα ἰδίως. *In Jo.* 2.431–2.

[280] *In Jo.* 2.432.

[281] Ibid.

[282] At this point, Cyril tried to assert the divinity of the Son, obviously in response to the Arian polemics.

[283] Cyril, at this point of his discourse (*In Jo.* 1.100), writes that he already discussed in the Discourse concerning the Holy Trinity (τῷ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος λόγῳ) about the divinity of the Son. This leads us to conclude, first, that the commentary was composed after his Dialogue on the Trinity. Second, that Cyril, once he discussed a point and elaborated on it, does not rewrite it again in another treatise. He does not repeat himself. Third, the Trinity is a topic that is of such paramount importance to him that he devoted a treatise to it. In fact, the Trinity is such an important topic to Cyril that he decided to write a separate treatise on it before proceeding with his exegetical work.

Πνεύματι).[284] Therefore, when the thought of creation was in the mind of the Father, the work of creation was done through the Son and all in the Spirit.

On another occasion Cyril discussed the manner in which the Word ascended into heaven. The Word accomplished this through his own power (δύναμις) being the Power and Wisdom of the Father. Everything is done by the Father not apart from the Son (πάντα μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς πλὴν οὐ δίχα τοῦ Υἱοῦ).[285] That is why John the Evangelist writes, *all things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being* (Jn 1:3). Consequently, since the Son is consubstantial with the Father, it follows "that all things are of the Father through the Son totally in the Spirit" (ὅτι πάντα μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς, δι᾽ Υἱοῦ δὲ πάντως ἐν Πνεύματι).[286] Cyril defined work in a different way. It is not only "work" as in the process of creation but also "work" as ascending into heaven. Any kinetic energy (ἐνέργειαν κίνησις)[287] exerted is considered "work" or considered an activity of the Son. Thus, any activity of the Godhead is done through the Son and totally in the Spirit.

When Cyril commented on Jn 4:34, *My food is to do the will of him who sent me and to complete his work* he began to explain that the work referred to in this verse is to send the Son, and this is understood to be with respect to the incarnation (κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τρόπον).[288] Therefore, the work in this verse presents Christ as the fulfiller or accomplisher (τελειωτής) of God's work. He was sent to complete the work of salvation. Cyril concludes with the explanation that "all things are by the Father through the Son in the Spirit" (πάντα γὰρ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[289] Here the work of the Son is completing the redemptive work through the Incarnation.

Cyril commented on Jn 15:1 *I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinegrower* to reflect on the relationship between the Father and the Son within the understanding of the Trinity. Christ is the vine who mothers and nurtures his branches. For we are begotten of Him and in Him in the Spirit to bring fruits of life (ἀνεγεννήθημεν γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν Πνεύματι πρὸς καρποφορίαν ζωῆς).[290] The nurturing work of the Son is

[284] *In Jo.* 1.128.
[285] *In Jo.* 2.661.
[286] Ibid.
[287] Ibid.
[288] *In Jo.* 1. 293.
[289] Ibid.
[290] *In Jo.* 2.535.

accomplished in the presence of the Spirit. It is a new life accompanied with faith and love towards him. The newness in us is maintained by our keeping the commandments that have been handed down to us. Cyril constantly declared that we should have an active role in our salvation and suggested that observing the commandments is considered one such activity.[291] We can keep the commandments by not grieving the Holy Spirit that is dwelling within us. For *all who obey his commandments abide in him, and he abides in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit that he has given us* (1 Jn 3:24). For by not grieving the Holy Spirit dwelling in us we attain Christ in us and we in Him. His dwelling within us nurtures us. For just as the root of the vine distributes to the branches enjoyment of its natural quality (ποιότητος φυσικῆς) so does the Word give the nature of God the Father to us through the inspiration of the Spirit. When the Father gets the title of husbandman (γεωργὸν), that does not mean that the Father is doing nothing or that he is idle while the Son is nourishing and perfecting human nature in the Spirit. Rather, the whole work of rectification is done by the holy and consubstantial Trinity (ὅλης δὲ ὥσπερ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος ἔργον ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐπανόρθωσις).[292] This power and wisdom to perform these actions belong to the whole Trinity. We call God a savior. At the same time, we do not attribute the salvific work partly to the Father, and partly to the Son or the Holy Spirit. We call our salvation the work of one Divinity (ἀλλ᾽ ὄντως τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος κατόρθωμα λέγοντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν).[293] Although we divide the activity of creation among the three persons of the Trinity, all things are from the Father through the Son in the Spirit (πάντα γὰρ παρὰ Πατρὸς δὶ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[294] Therefore, as the work of creation was done by the Trinity so the Father nourishes us in piety through the Son in the Spirit (ὅτι τρέφει μὲν ἡμᾶς εἰς εὐσέβειαν ὁ Πατὴρ δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[295] Cyril did consider that each person of the Trinity could have a separate activity when dealing with humanity. For the Son is the vine and the Father is the husbandman and we cannot be nourished by one separate from the other. Cyril concluded his argument once again by confirming that all things are from the Father by the Son and in the Spirit (πάντα γὰρ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[296] Cyril made it even more clear by asserting that there

[291] *In Jo.* 2.409.
[292] *In Jo.* 2.536.
[293] Ibid.
[294] *In Jo.* 2.537.
[295] Ibid.
[296] Ibid.

is no division of activity, though we may consider varied aspects of activity (ἐκεῖ τὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας οὐ μεμερισμένον, κἄν ποικίλως τε καὶ διαθόρως ἐνεργεῖσθαι τυχὸν νοοῖτό τινι).[297] For there is only one substance (οὐσίας) that is the true Godhead that is conceived in three persons. Throughout this argument Cyril attempted to explain the diversity of divine operations while establishing the unity of the essence of the Trinity.

Cyril also discussed another activity done by the Trinity in unity. He explained the meaning of the verse *Just as the living Father sent me* (Jn 6:57). Cyril clarifies that the word "sent" cannot mean anything other than the Incarnation. He therefore investigates the operation of the Incarnation. It is written he was sent by the Father, that is, he was incarnate by the Father. At the same time, Gabriel attributes the making of the divine body to the activity of the Spirit (τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ), where Cyril referred to the announcement in the Lukan narrative.[298] Thus, we understand that the operation of the Incarnation was the work of the one nature of the Godhead. We conceive the Godhead as in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, where they did not work separately but all work is accomplished by the whole of the divine nature. The Trinity is one with respect to its power and everything else for all things are of the Father through the Son in the Spirit (πάντα γὰρ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι).[299] Therefore, the detailed operation of the Word taking humanity is a work done by the Trinity and cannot be attributed to the Son alone, he being the Word Incarnate.

Finally, how do we interpret that *all things were made through him*? Does this mean that the Son is rendering services (ὑπουργὸς) or doing the will of another? This might make some think that he could no longer be conceived as Creator. But he is the power (δύναμις) of God and as Son he works all things having the Father and the Holy Spirit as co-workers (συνεργαζομένοι).[300] Again, Cyril ends his argument asserting that "for all

---

[297] Ibid.

[298] *In Jo.* 1.538. In this example, Cyril is speaking about Gabriel's participation during the Incarnation process in announcing the Spirit's contribution to the creation of the body of Christ. It should be clarified that at the beginning of his exposition, Cyril made it clear that Christ was a complete human being (ἄνθρωπον ὁλοκλήρως). By this term we understand that Cyril believed that the humanity of Christ included a soul and not just the σῶμα as might be implied in this part of his exposition. Further discussion of the nature of humanity acquired by Christ, according to Cyril, will be discussed under the title "Son."

[299] *In Jo.* 1.538.

[300] *In Jo.* 1.68.

things are from the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit" (πάντα γὰρ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι).[301] Even though the work of creation is always attributed to the Word, Cyril still asserted that creation is done by the Trinity using his famous formula that describes the relationship of each person of the Trinity.

Through these many examples Cyril tried to explain that any activity attributed to God or to any person of the Trinity is in reality the joint activity of all three persons. Creation is done through the Word. It is clear from the scriptural text that the whole of the Trinity participated in the act of creation. This clearly defeats the accusation by some who want to eliminate the Son from the divine triad and reduce him to just an instrument of the Father. The activity of the Trinity does not separate each person from the other nor divide the activity, rather it portrays the varied aspect of each person and preserves their individuality. The activity of the Godhead varies from the act of creation to bringing the wrath on Sodom and Gomorrah to ascending to heaven or accomplishing the salvation of humanity, which included the Incarnation. The Son is not an instrument but a fulfiller and an accomplisher of God's work. In summation, all activity of the Godhead is summarized in the formula; "all things are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit."

Oneness of the Trinity

Though Cyril gave attention to the activity of the Trinity, he was even more concerned with the oneness of the Godhead. When Cyril wrote about creation and that all things are made through the Son and that nothing was made without him, he emphasized that the Son is not fulfilling the wishes of the Father as would one person rendering services to another. Rather, creation is a joint activity by the whole Trinity, following the Trinitarian formula that all things are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. He further elaborated on the oneness of the Trinity. For instance, he gave the example of the flower and its fragrance. He said we could not say that the flower was present at the operation (ἐνεργειαν) of sweet fragrance. Fragrance proceeds naturally (ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρόεισι φυσικῶς) from the flower. The fragrance and the flower cannot be separated. The same applies to the Father and the Son, the Son does not work apart from the Father (ἐργάζεσθαι ... δίχα τοῦ Πατρὸς) nor does the Father remain still or stationary (ἀτρεμούσης) while the Son is working.[302] If each works apart or

[301] Ibid.
[302] *In Jo.* 1.68.

separately then we have two creators rather than one. He also gave the example of the sun and its radiance explaining that we cannot separate the sun from its radiance. Following this example he concluded that the Father is conceived in truth as Father. The Son is being conceived as Son and the same with the Holy Spirit. We cannot separate any person of the Trinity from the other. The number of the Trinity amounts to one and the same Godhead (ὁ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος ἀριθμὸς εἰς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀναβαίνει θεότητα).[303] As previously mentioned, for how will God be conceived as being one and be called God, if each of the indicated persons (ἰδιότητα) withdraws (ἀναχθρήσει) completely—while being wholly removed from having continuity of nature with the other and of the essential conditions?[304] Cyril continued to explain that we should conceive of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit according to their personal being (τοῦ εἶναι ἰδιοσυστάτως) and not mixing the difference of the persons or the names.[305] While reserving for each their own name, we still refer to one Godhead. While the Son is called Word, wisdom, radiance, impress (χαρακτήρ), and power of God not one of these characteristics can sever the Son from the Father. Thus, when the Father works the Son will work, since he is his natural, essential, and truly existent power (ἐργαζονένου δηλον ότι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ ἐργάσεται, ὡς δύναμις φυσική τε καὶ οὐσιώδης καὶ ἐνυπόστατος αὐτοῦ).[306] Again, he clarified his explanation by an example of the fire and heat where separation is hardly conceivable.[307] For if we conceive of them separately then we conceive of two gods (ἵνα μὴ δύο νοῶται θεοὶ).[308] Cyril elaborated by writing that in each example that he has given, the fire and heat, flower and fragrance, sun and radiance, light and radiance, in each of these examples the generator is not separate in thought (ἐπινοὶα) from the generated and that which springs forth is

[303] *In Jo.* 1.69.

[304] Ibid.

[305] Ibid.

[306] *In Jo.* 1.70.

[307] Cyril, at this point, had in mind the Arians who wanted to separate the Father from the Son and reduce the Son to a creature. The reason that Cyril was defending the divinity of the Son, is that otherwise there will be separation between the Father and the Son and thus a fall into a duality of the Godhead or multiple Gods. Although the context is the Arian controversy, the threat is dismantling the unity of the Trinity and the oneness of the Godhead. If the three persons are not of equal nature and essence, then the theme of the Incarnation, deification, salvation will fall apart.

[308] *In Jo.* 1.71.

indivisible (ἀμερίστως).[309] Activities of the Trinity are different and distinct only in our thoughts (ἐπινοίᾳ) but we cannot separate the persons who generate this energy.

The notion that we cannot separate the persons generating the activity is closely linked to the parable of the vine and the husbandman, where Cyril argued for the fundamental recognition of the different activities and at the same time not dividing the Trinity. Cyril continually defended the oneness and unity of the Trinity. Cyril made it clear that the intellectual recognition of divergent persons and divergent activities must not lead us to conclude separation of persons, lest we fall into suggesting different or multiple gods. This is a crucial point in Cyrillian thought. Any separation leads to multiplicity of cause or origin and thus leads one to think of a multiple Godhead. In the parable of the vine and the husbandman previously mentioned Cyril spoke of no division of activity (ἐκεῖ τὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας) though intellectually we may think of diversity or varied aspects of the same thing (ποικίλως).[310] At the same time we have one ousia (μιᾶς δὲ οὐσίας) we have one source of all these activities and that is the true and real Godhead that is conceived in three persons. When we speak of any activity then we recognize at the same time that it is the function of one divinity or one Godhead. He spoke of varied ἐνέργειαι but this variation comes from one source, no matter how varied these activities may be.

Cyril explains how God reveals Himself to humanity. Cyril commented on Jn 6:45 *It is written in the prophets, 'And they shall all be taught by God.' Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me* by speaking about free choice of human beings and on the means of teaching.[311] The Father gives knowledge of Christ to those who are worthy through persuasion. They hear, learn, and receive good instruction in the doctrines through their own free power and free will. That free will is embedded in their human soul. Otherwise, we could not claim and demand our rewards for our good deeds.[312] Therefore, we have freedom of instruction and freedom to follow these instructions. The Father will accomplish (ἐνεργήσει) the revelation of his own Son to those who are worthy through his Wisdom. For the Son is

[309] *In Jo.* 1.72.

[310] *In Jo.* 2.537.

[311] The idea of free will in the *Commentary on John* has received great attention from Cyril. Cyril linked free will of human beings to the free will of the Son and this in turn is understood within the Trinitarian understanding of the relationship of the three persons of the Trinity. The study of free-will is important and cannot be understood outside Cyril's Trinitarian understanding.

[312] *In Jo.* 1.507–8.

the wisdom of the Father (σοφία δὲ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός).[313] Again, the activity of revealing knowledge of God is done through the Son, although the revelation is about the Son and the mystery of Christ. As previously mentioned, all divine activity is done through the Son, and in this case if it concerns the Son, it is still Wisdom that reveals knowledge to those who are worthy of it. Cyril added that the activity of the Father or his will towards any person is carried out through the Son. At the same time, the activity of the Son and that of the Holy Spirit when carried out is said to be an activity of the whole of the Trinity (πάσης εἶναι λέγων τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος).[314] Thus, when the Father wants to reveal his own Son, the Son himself is doing this and no less the Holy Spirit (καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦτο ποιῶν εὑρίσκεται, διὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ οὐδὲν ἧττον τὸ Ἅγιον).[315] Cyril confirmed his argument by citing a Pauline verse, *for I did not receive it from a human source, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ*, proving that the Holy Spirit is taking part of the revelation of Christ to us (ἄν ὅτι καὶ οὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον οὐδεν ἧττον ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύπτει Χριστόν).[316] To confirm that the Spirit has a role in handing down knowledge to believers Cyril referred to Jn 16: 12–13, *I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, because he will take what is mine and declare it to you.* The Holy Spirit, being a Spirit of Truth, will illuminate those in whom he is (πνεῦμα γὰρ ἀληθείας ὑπάρχοί φωταγωγήσει τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἄν γένοιτο).[317] However, this does not mean that we are severing them or alienating the Father from the Son or either from the Holy Spirit, for there is one Godhead (μία θεότης). Cyril again affirmed that we preach the holy and consubstantial Trinity. The attributes belong to each without dividing or separating the will (βουλάς) or the

[313] *In Jo.* 1.508.

[314] Ibid.

[315] Ibid.

[316] Ibid.

[317] *In Jo.* 1.509. It is important to notice that throughout the commentary Cyril constantly referred to "I am the Truth" and the Spirit is "the Spirit of Truth" and also used the term the "Spirit of the Son" or "the Spirit of Christ," where the latter is based on the logical deduction of the two previously mentioned statements. This logical deduction has led many to conclude that Cyril was affirming the filioque theology. Cyril never suggested it to be the Spirit of procession but rather of possession, it is the Son's own spirit. This point will be clear when we discuss the "Son" and the "Holy Spirit."

operation (ἐνεργείας) of the Godhead.[318] Through this explanation Cyril was affirming the individuality of each person of the Trinity, yet insisting on their unity. This unity preserves the identification of the ἐνέργεια of each as well as the βουλή. Cyril again reworded his argument and says that the Son is revealed through the Father as the Father is revealed through the Son.

After explaining how knowledge of God is bestowed from the Trinity to humanity, Cyril explained how the spoken words of Christ are the same as those of God. Spoken words are considered a form of transmission of knowledge of God to humanity equal to the transmission of revelation through the Son in the Holy Spirit as discussed in the previous passage. Cyril elaborated on this point when he comments on Jn 14:10, *The words that I say to you I do not speak on my own; but the Father who dwells in me does his works*. Cyril begins with a differing premise; the verse begins with the words said by Christ, but Cyril began his exposition with the words that the Father speaks. What the Father speaks is what Christ is now saying. He continued his explanation by noting that the Father and the Son are of equal essence, therefore they do not only speak the same words but also do the same works. Thus, if the Godhead is one, in the Father and the Son and the Spirit, every word that is from the Father is through the Son in the Spirit; and every work beyond expectations is through the Son in the Spirit and considered coming from the Father.[319] The nature of the work of the Father shines through the Son. In this explanation, Cyril connected the utterance of words with action, as if he were giving power to the words equal to the power of actions, and that words perform actions, as in creation narrative where utterance contained the force of creation. All this action, whether in words or work, is done through the Trinity. Cyril concluded his exposition by again confirming the reading of the verse that the words and works of the Son are that of the Father. The Father speaks through the Son, for the Son is his Word. Through the Son he works wonders, for he carries this out through his own power, that is, the Son is the power of the Father.[320]

When Cyril commented on Jn 10:37,38, *If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me. But if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe the works, so that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father*, he was again faced with a verse dealing with work ἔργον and

---

[318] *In Jo.* 1.509.

[319] ἐπεὶ καὶ μιᾶς οὔσης τῆς θεότητος, ἔν τε Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ Πνεύματι νοουμένης, ἅπας μὲν λόγος ὁ παρὰ Πατρὸς, πάντως ἐστὶ δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι. καὶ πᾶν ἔργον, ἤτοι παράδοξον, δι᾽ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι. *In Jo.* 2.429.

[320] *In Jo.* 2.430.

how this work reveals the relationship between the Father and the Son. Cyril in this instance argued in defense of the divinity of the Son against the Arians. He started by explaining that the Son is equal to the Father because the former does work that is endowed with divine quality (δι' ὧν ποιῶ θεοπρεπῶν ἔργων) though being in the flesh (σάρκα) he seems to be like one of us.[321] Because of this, it is possible to perceive that *the Father is in me and I am in the Father*, understanding that both are of the same essence. Cyril noted that we cannot apply the same thing to ourselves. Although all humans are of the same nature, because of our bodies we cannot call ourselves one. Since the divinity is incorporeal this would not apply, although we conceive of each person of the Trinity as distinct. Though the Trinity is three persons, each person does not denote part of the Trinity but the whole of it. God is indivisible and simple although in three persons.[322] Again, the unity and oneness of the Trinity is emphasized in Cyril's explanation.

When Cyril commented on Jn 6:28 he used a similar argument to the one he employed previously but concluded the argument with a unique example. Again, the Arian teaching is on his mind and he is determined to refute it. Cyril argues that "they"——the heretical entity, which in this case means the Arians—are trying to sever the Son from the Father. However, they do not understand that to exist does not mean that he is of another essence than the Father (οὐσίας ἀλλότριον);[323] for *I am in the Father and the*

---

[321] *In Jo.* 2.261.

[322] *In Jo.* 2.261. This discussion about the unity of the Trinity is taken from a Syriac fragment. Actually the text of the *Commentary on John* is intact except for books seven and eight that are collected from catanae or fragments. This quote is from book seven. Liébaert depends on a detailed manuscript study done by Reuss. The latter divided the catanae into six different types and labeled the six groups as type A to type F. Liébaert asserted after his investigation that Pusey's edition (the edition upon which this research is based) was a considerable improvement over previous texts. I assume that Liébaert is referring to the *Patrologiae Graeca* edition here. Though Pusey's text is the best available, Liébaert still wanted to clarify that Pusey did not consult in his edition manuscripts of type C and D. Reuss tried to amend this by publishing two fragments from manuscripts of type C and D providing texts for Jn 10:36; Jn 11:11; and Jn 12:45. Liébaert, *Doctrine christologique*, 75–76. And Joseph Reuss, "Cyril von Alexandrien und sein Kommentar zum Johannes Evangelium," *Biblica* 25 (1944): 207–209. The authenticity of some of these fragments has been argued but in this text to which we have just referred, the thought is very consistent with that of Cyril, and this text could be considered authentic since it conforms with the rest of the thought in Cyril's work.

[323] *In Jo.* 1.450.

Father is in me, and therefore will not withdraw into a separate personality (εἰς ἰδιότητα).[324] Then Cyril concluded that the Holy Trinity is conceived as one in the Godhead (διὰ τὸ ἐν μιᾷ θεότητι τὴν ἁγίαν νοεῖσθαι Τριάδα).[325] Once he affirmed the oneness of the Trinity, Cyril stated that he would confirm this by an example from the Law (ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ παραδείγματος νομικοῦ).[326] In other words, he resorted to the Old Testament to confirm the Trinity.

In the Book of Exodus the Lord says to Moses that the children of Israel shall give a ransom for their souls. They shall give half of a didrachma as an offering to the Lord which is equivalent to a didrachm according to the offering of the sanctuary (Ex 30:13).[327] Cyril pointed out that this shadowed Christ (ἐσκιαγραφεῖτο Χριστὸς) for Christ offered himself for all creation as a ransom to God the Father. The offering is usually one drachma but not separate from the other, for the coin is actually two drachma (δύο δραχμάς).[328] Therefore, to affirm the unity, Cyril provided an example from the Law. Though Christ is a ransom and therefore this requires only one drachma no one drachma can be offered, for the coin is a didrachma. Thus, the Son and the Father are inseparable.

From the sample of texts quoted it is clear that Cyril repeatedly affirmed the Trinity and its oneness. Liébaert rightly commented that the Trinitarian question remained Cyril's preoccupation throughout the whole of the commentary though he never pursued his comment any further.[329]

---

[324] Ibid.

[325] Ibid.

[326] Ibid.

[327] The δίδραχμον was a double drachma. It was a temple tax that was sufficient to ransom two persons. That is, one drachma was for one person but it was usually used in the dual δίδραχμον rather than the singular δραχμή. This is demonstrated in Mt 17:24–27 where Christ asks Peter to fish and give taxes for both Peter and himself. It is interesting to note here that Cyril was using the LXX and thus using the Greek coin system rather than the shekel as mentioned in the Hebrew text. The δραχμή is a Greek coin equivalent to one forth the Hebrew shekel. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 353–4.

[328] *In Jo.* 1.450.

[329] Liébaert emphasized in his study the pre-Nestorian texts. Thus, he focused mainly on the *Thesaurus* and the *Dialogues* and occasionally on *The Commentary on the Gospel of John.* Though his focus was not the Johannine commentary he had the great insight to comment the following: "L'ouvrage est en majeure partie dirigé contre l'arianisme. La question trinitaire reste toujours au premier plan des préoccupations de Cyrille." Liébaert, *La Doctrine christologique*, 85. Meanwhile, Koen

Dratsellas comments that the Incarnation of the Son has not changed the relationship between the Logos, the Father, and the Holy Spirit, when he writes, "Here we have the same relation between all Persons of the Holy Trinity before and after the Incarnation of the Logos since this Incarnation does not mean change of the Divinity of the Logos."[330]

Other modern scholars have mentioned the Cyrillian Trinitarian discussion but usually from diverse perspectives. Du Manoir observed that Cyril continued to speak about the Trinity even after the Trinity had been definitively settled and he still compares it with the pagan model. Du Manoir's comments on the pagan comparison are based on the *Contra Julianum* text where Cyril devoted the whole treatise to refute paganism with some focus on Platonic arguments.[331] As a teacher and educator, Cyril was forced to repeat and emphasize the Christian doctrines. He did this with the intention of affirming the Trinitarian dogma to his readers, to refute heresies, and, according to Cyril's way of thinking, there is no way to speak about God if we do not speak about the Trinity. Therefore, speaking about the Trinity was unavoidable even if the Trinitarian issue was settled.[332]

Another approach to the Trinitarian understanding in Cyril's thought is found in Louth's article about the use of the term ἴδιος. Louth notes that Athanasius uses the term ἴδιος in the Trinitarian sense to "express uniqueness of the Trinitarian relationships—the Son and the Spirit are related to God the Father in a way utterly different from creatures—but also the intimacy and closeness of the intratrinitrarian relationships."[333]

---

briefly mentions that Cyril treated the "Incarnation in a trinitarian context." Lars Koen, *The Saving Passion. Incarnational and Soteriological Thought in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel of John.* Studia Doctrinae Christianae Upsaliensia, 31 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1991), 66.

[330] C. Dratsellas, "Questions on Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria," *Abba Salama* 6 (1974): 227–8. Dratsellas wrote a short paragraph concerning this topic in which he quoted three times *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* and used three quotes from different post-Nestorian works. Though he does not pursue the topic beyond this one paragraph, his finding a continuous thought between the pre and post Nestorian works is a point worth noting.

[331] Du Manoir, *Dogme et Spiritualité*, 42–3.

[332] Meijering also focused on the pagan aspect of Cyril's Trinitarian discussion. He compared the ideas of Cyril about the Trinity with those of Numenius, Plotinus, and Porphyry. This comparative work is also based on *Contra Julianum*. E. P. Meijerin, "Cyril of Alexandria on the Platonists and the Trinity," in *God Being History* (Amsterdam: Oxford, 1975), 114–127.

[333] A Louth, "The use of the term ἴδιος in Alexandrian Theology from Alexander to Cyril," *Studia Patristica* 19(1989): 199.

Nevertheless, the term ἴδιος was also used by Athanasius to characterize the relationship between the two natures of Christ. The Logos takes the body and makes it his own body. This connection is directly related to Athanasius' understanding of the theme of salvation as presented in his *On the Incarnation of the Word.*[334] Louth continues:

> These two usages of ἴδιος—the trinitarian and the Christological—clearly go together for Athanasius, because both (the intimacy of the Son with the Father, and the intimacy of the union of human and divine in Christ) are necessary for the accomplishment of redemption: so he suggests that those who deny the son is the Father's own should go on to deny that he took true flesh from Mary the Ever-Virgin.[335]

Louth goes on to argue that because of the influence of Athanasius on Cyril, the latter conveys in his writings a very similar picture. Louth writes:

> The Son's consubstantial relationship to the Father is often expressed by saying that the Son is the Father's own…. The Spirit, too, is ἴδιος and ὁμοούσιος. Even where Cyril does not use the terms ἴδιος, we find him expounding the trinitarian relationships in ways familiar from Athanasius, and taking these ideas further. For instance, at the very beginning of his commentary on John, he argues that the Son is οὐκ ἔξωθεν to his Father, he is not ἔκφυλος or ξένος, he exists together with the Father inseparably (συνυπάρχον καὶ ἀχωρίστως), together they form μία φύσις…. Like Athanasius, Cyril transfers the use of ἴδιος from trinitarian to a Christological context: the Word makes his body his own.[336]

The point that ἴδιος is used in the Trinitarian as well as the Christological meaning shows the reality of the interconnection between the Trinity and understanding the Incarnation. The Logos must be understood within a Trinitarian context, otherwise the power and validity of the Incarnation is useless. If the Son is not divine and part of the Trinity, he has no salvific or sanctifying power. The Son has to make the body his own in order to be able to preserve the unity with the Trinity and within this unity the Son is able to deify humanity.

Gregory Nazianzen in his oration on Athanasius, praises Athanasius for "he [Athanasius] admirably guarded the oneness of the Godhead and

---

[334] This is linked to the argument at the beginning of this chapter that Athanasius' understanding of salvation and the Incarnation was the greater framework that guided Cyril's theology.

[335] Louth, *Use of ἴδιος*, 200.

[336] Ibid., 201.

religiously taught the Trinity." (καὶ τὸ ἕν καλῶς ἐτήρησε, θεότητι γάρ· καὶ τὸ τρία εὐσεβῶς ἐδίδαξεν).[337] Not only did the early writers recognize the Trinitarian pattern of Athanasius but also modern scholars have noticed that "Athanasius sought to safeguard the divinity of the Son and at the same time recognize the reality of the Incarnation and life of Jesus. His interest is completely Trinitarian, but the lines among which he shaped his answer were to provide the center of the later Alexandrian passion for the unity of Christ."[338] The Trinitarian idea constitutes the main theological framework within which Cyril, as well as Athanasius, work their theological projects. We discussed the straightforward arguments by which Cyril describes the interrelationship between the three persons of the Trinity, for example the Cyrillian formula "from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit." When Cyril wrote his second anti-Arian writing *De sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* he approached the Trinitarian argument as follows. The text was written using the form of a dialogue and it includes seven dialogues. The first six are about the Son and the seventh and last is about the Holy Spirit. Thus, Cyril himself approached the Trinity in his treatise by discussing each person of the Trinity. Having the introductory background about the Trinity in this chapter we will proceed to speak individually about the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

The Father

God being the Father of the Son and the Only Begotten is a major theme in Christian theology. It became even more important during the Arian controversy when the divinity of the Son was challenged. The counter argument against the Arians was to affirm that the Son, being truly Son, is of the same essence as that of the Father and is therefore divine and one of the Godhead. This point, the Father as the begetter and Father of the Son, we choose to discuss under the title Son, because the Father is the Father of the Son. A relationship—since by definition it is a relation between two—that gives us the convenience to discuss either from the Father's or from the Son's side. Though in the case of the divine Trinity both are one, it is easier to approach it under the Son title because it is profoundly linked with the Incarnation. This section will thus discuss what is unique to the Father, that is, fatherhood and knowledge of the Father.

---

[337] *Orations* 21 (PG 35. 1096C).

[338] Robert Wilken, "Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies," *Church History* 34 (1965): 129.

The other aspect of the divine fatherhood involves the relationship to humanity, since we are instructed to address him as "Our Father who art in heaven." Cyril, in his first book, argued extensively against many heretical teachings. Of course, having Arianism as one of his main opponents, he argued that the Father is the begetter of the Son and therefore the Son is of the same essence as that of the Father. Proceeding from this point, Cyril discussed the fatherhood of humanity being in the image of God's fatherhood. Cyril began to argue that, due to being created in the likeness of God, we are able to be fathers of our own children. Cyril noted that we received the name of family or fathership (τὸ τῆς πατριᾶς ἤτοι πατρότητος) from God and not vice versa based on Eph. 3:15, *from whom every family in heaven and on earth takes it name*.[339] We are fathers by imitation of him who is the primordial precedent of all humanity (τὸ πάντων ἐστι πρεσβύτατον).[340] We are fathers by imitation because we are made in his own image (πεποιῆσθαι κατ᾽ εἰκόνα). Therefore, by nature, he is Father of the Word and is begetter and we, who are created in his image, are also fathers of our children.[341]

When in Jn 6:52 we read that *the Jews disputed among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat"* Cyril argued that the "Jews" ought not ask "how." Cyril redirected the question and suggests that rather than asking "how" they should study his works (τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων).[342] Cyril modified this statement further and noted that even if we study his works still no one knows who God is by nature; however, this should not stop us for God *rewards those who seek him* (Heb. 11:6). Therefore, our knowledge of God is based on the study of his works, which is carried out through seeking him. Based on previous arguments, then, we can conclude that we cannot know God except through his Son who is his power and work.

The knowledge of the Father through the Son is clearly stated in Jn 14:7, *If you know me, you will know my Father also. From now on you do know him, and have seen him.* Having said that, Christ then had to testify (ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ) to the disciples the knowledge of the Father and said, *from now on (ἀπάρτι)*

---

[339] *In Jo.* 1.37.

[340] *In Jo.* 1.38.

[341] Ibid. The premise of this argument is based on the creation narrative that states we are made in God's image. A detailed study of the "image" and "likeness" can be found in Burghardt where he traced the use of both terms from the early church fathers until the time of Cyril. Since Burghardt gave a detailed attention to this topic we will not pursue this topic here. Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 1–12.

[342] *In Jo.* 1.526.

you do know him, and have seen him. What he meant by "from now on" (ἀπάρτι) is not the time of uttering this statement but rather beginning from the time of his presence among us, from the time of the Incarnation.[343] The Psalmist speaking of God the Father says, *The knowledge of thee is too wonderful for me* (Ps 138:6 LXX); according to Cyril, this is because we saw the Son's incredibly marvelous deeds (θαυματουργήμασι).[344] Through the Son we not only know the Father but also see him. For knowledge (γνῶσις) might be from private mental contemplation through which we come to understand both the divine and inexpressible, ineffable nature of God (τῆς θείας τε καὶ ἀρρήτου φύσεως).[345] To have seen the fullness of God, which is different from knowledge through mental contemplation, signifies our full knowledge through vision of his miraculous works (τὴν διὰ τῶν τερατουργημάτων πληροφορίαν σημαίνει).[346] Therefore, we have not only ascertained facts through mental knowledge that God the Father is the creator but we have seen all things under his subjugation through the works of his Son. The Son rebuked the sea and winds. Thus, creation is under the subjugation of the Son as of the Father. The Law of Moses said, *The Lord our God is one Lord* (Deut. 6:4) because the people of old could not be driven away by worshiping more than one God like other nations. Therefore, the distinctiveness of the Person of the Father from that of the Son could not be revealed to them. Nevertheless, by the Word's Incarnation we know that the Father has done his mighty works through the Son. He has also shown that the nature of the Godhead is shown in the Holy Trinity and is truly one (καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι νοουμένην τε καὶ ὑφεστῶσαν ἀληθῶς μίαν ἔδειξε θεότητος φύσιν).[347]

It is through the Son that we know the Father. Thus, we now turn our attention to the Son, to know both the Father *and* the Son.

The Son

The Gospel of John begins with a Christian rewriting of Genesis 1:1 that describes the Incarnation and asserts the divinity of the Logos. Following the prologue is a collection of speeches or λογικόι and events through which the Incarnate Word reveals his nature, his message, and establishes the new covenant. Finally, we have the passion narrative together with the

[343] *In Jo.* 2.415.
[344] *In Jo.* 2.416.
[345] Ibid.
[346] Ibid.
[347] *In Jo.* 2.417

resurrection. The theological themes that Cyril tackled are consequently following the same themes as that of the Gospel of John. Therefore, in this commentary, the broad themes that Cyril covered concerning the Son are the generation of the Son from the Father, the unity but maintained distinctiveness of each person of the Trinity, the attributes or titles of the Son, the Incarnation, and the death of Christ and its salvific effect. Many other minor topics are included in the commentary but the present discussion will be restricted to the above mentioned topics since they form the main framework of the text.

Cyril followed the scriptural verses that assert that we know the Father through the Son and the Son is the one who can give us the true knowledge of the Father. Commenting on Jn 8:55, *but I do know him and I keep his word*, Cyril wrote that the Son has knowledge of his own Father—not such knowledge as in us—but divinely suitable and such that cannot be commented upon (οἶδεν ὁ Υἱὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πατέρα, οὐ τοιαύτην ἔχων γνῶσιν ὁποία πέρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐν ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ θεοπρεπῆ τε καὶ ἀνεξήγητον).[348] Human beings do not ask their begetter about their own human nature, but each knows and understands their essence from their own selves. The Son also knows his own Father because they are of the same essence and because the Son is his Word, for it is clear that the Word is defining (δηλοῖ γὰρ ὁ λόγος τὸν ὅρον).[349] This means that the Word has the definition and essence of the Father for λόγος means definition. Thus, it is the Son who is capable of knowing the Father since he is his Logos. For the Son is his image (εἰκὼν) and the impress (χαρακτὴρ) of him.[350]

Not only is the knowledge of the Father unable to be commented upon but the generation of the Son is also inexplicable (ἀνεξήγητον).[351] Isaiah himself said, *Who shall declare his generation? For his life is taken away from the earth* (Is 53:8 LXX). What is lifted from the earth is the account of the Only Begotten's generation (ὁ περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως λόγος τοῦ Μονογενοῦς) for it is above our understanding. We are of this earth and bound by time and it is hard to understand the "beginning" since He is before time. For "beginning" is related to time and the Son is before and older than time and ages. The Father is considered the source (πηγῆς) of the Son who is in him being his wisdom, power, impress, radiance, and image of the Father (σοφία καὶ δύναμις καὶ χαρακτὴρ καὶ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ

348 *In Jo.* 1.128.
349 Ibid. λόγος can also mean "definition." Liddell and Scott, 1058.
350 *In Jo.* 1.129.
351 *In Jo.* 1.17.

εἰκὼν ὑπάρχων αὐτοῦ.)[352] Therefore, there is no time when the Father is not all of these attributes being wisdom, power, and radiance. Since the Father is everlasting, and the Son has the attributes of the Father, so is the Son everlasting.[353] That is to say, having the Father, who is the source of the Son, being before times, and having the Son as the express image of the Father, the Son is therefore everlasting. Since the Son is everlasting, then his generation from the Father is beyond time and thus free from the generation of time; moreover, his generation cannot be defined by time.

Cyril's insistence on enumerating the attributes of the Son was required by the necessity of proving the divinity of the Son and his being of the same essence as the Father. If the attributes mentioned are of a divine nature, then the Son shares in the divinity of the Father.[354] In addition, the attributes of the Son reveal the Father, for the attributes of the Son are the attributes of the Father. For the Father is seen in the Son and the Son is seen in the Father (ὡς ὁρᾶσθαι μὲν ἐν Υἱῷ τὸν Πατέρα, ἐν δὲ τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν).[355] The comments on Gen. 19:24, as previously mentioned, attribute to the Son the "power and arm" (δύναμις αὐτοῦ καὶ βραχίων) of God.[356] It is through the Son, that is, the power and arm of the Father, that fire rained upon the Sodomites. Therefore, we have one who sends (ἐξαπόστειλον) and another who is sent (ἀποστέλλοντα)[357] but both are one. In the same way, if the Son is the radiance and reflection (ἀπαύγασμά) of the Father, as he is light of light, he is his own distinct being, but of the same essence as the Father.[358]

---

[352] *In Jo.* 1.18.

[353] *In Jo.* 1.18 and 1.40.

[354] As Cyril used the Son to be of the same essence as that of the Father to prove the equality and the divinity of the Son, he also used the Holy Spirit to prove the divinity of the Son. For when the Son uses his own Spirit to work wonders this also demonstrates his divinity. This will be shown during the exposition of the verses on the Holy Spirit.

[355] *In Jo.* 1.25.

[356] *In Jo.* 1.28.

[357] *In Jo.* 1.29.

[358] *In Jo.* 1.27. ἀπαύγασμά was mentioned only once in the New Testament in Heb. 1:3, to which Cyril is referring to in this statement. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Son is the ἀπαύγασμά τῆς δόξης the reflection of the glory of God. Therefore, in the New Testament the only time the word ἀπαύγασμά is mentioned it has the meaning of "reflection" a meaning that is assigned in the passive sense. However, Cyril used the same word in his commentary to mean radiance and effulgence of light, and linked it with the Son being "light of light." This meaning reflects the active sense of the word. Others like Origen, Gregory of Nyssa,

The attributes and titles of the Son signify the divinity of the Son, therefore, the Son is not lesser than the Father. Cyril candidly stated that he listed the varied names of the Son in an attempt to disprove the Arian claim that the Son is not equal to the Father. The Son is the wisdom and power of the Father (σοφίαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ δύναμιν τοῦ Πατρὸς).[359] He is the light and truth of the Father (καὶ φῶς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλήθεια).[360] He is also righteousness (δικαιοσύνη).[361] Since the Psalm states, *in your righteousness give me life*, Cyril added that the Father gives life to those who believe in Christ. Life is given to the believers through Christ and in Christ. Moreover, the Son is the counsel of the Lord.[362] Therefore, since the Father is perfect, the Son is also perfect and he is wisdom, power, light, truth, life, and the counsel of the Father. Consequently, the Son is equal to the Father.

The Son is revealed to us through his titles. Cyril commented on Jn 8: 24, *for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he*, by writing that we truly need to believe in Christ in order to have life or we will die in our sins. We have to believe that he is God from God. He is also Savior, redeemer, king and truly Lord. If we do not believe that he is all these titles we will perish. In addition, he is the light that came and the glory of the Lord that has risen.[363] He is the healer of our bruises, where our bruises are the afflictions and sins from which we suffer.[364] He is the forgiver of sins, who whitens our sins even if they were like scarlet.[365] He is not only the healer of spiritual afflictions, but also the bodily ones. He opens the eyes of the blind, the ears of the deaf, gives the lame the power to walk and the stammerers strength to speak clearly.[366] He will also come with strength and with power to tend to the flocks, for he is the shepherd.[367] He is the messenger of the covenant.[368] He is the sacrifice and the offering.[369] He is also the law that

---

Theodoret, and Chrysostom used the word in the active and connected it with φῶς ἐκ φωτός as well. Bauer, *A Greek English Lexicon*, 82. This is important because in *In Jo.* 2, 19–20, Cyril used the titles of Christ to demonstrate the active role of Christ in our salvation and not dying in our sins. Titles are used here to demonstrate the divinity of the Son but at the same time reflect his work and his salvific act.

[359] *In Jo.* 1:32. Based on verse 1 Cor. 2:4.

[360] *In Jo.* 1.33. Ps 43:3.

[361] Ibid., Ps 119:40.

[362] Ibid., Ps 33:11.

[363] *In Jo.* 2.20. Is 50:1.

[364] *In Jo.* 2.20 Jer. 3:22 LXX.

[365] Ibid. Is 53:25; Is 1:16–18.

[366] Ibid., Is 35:5,6.

[367] Ibid., Is 53:9–11.

[368] Ibid., Mal 3:1,2.

Moses preached.[370] In summation, we have the Son who is light, healer, forgiver of sins, shepherd, messenger of the covenant, sacrifice, and law. It is interesting to notice that all the titles that Cyril utilized are Old Testament titles. In his explication he did not venture to combine those of the Old with the New Testament's. It is possible that Cyril wanted to restrict his exegesis of Jn 8:25 in answer to the question, *who are you*? Since those who questioned him were the Jewish leaders and his listeners were also Jews, perhaps Cyril was responding as he envisioned Christ would respond. His long complex answer is dependent upon what his audience would recognize, in this case, Old Testament prophecies. However, at the same time, it is important to recognize all of these titles, because if a believer does not acknowledge the Son to be light, forgiver, and sacrifice among other things, we are going to die in our sins. We must recognize the Son as equal to the Father. In this way, he explained who the Father is by shedding light on the titles of the Son. To know the Father we have to know the Son.

Cyril again reaffirmed that the attributes of the Father are of the Son and vice versa. If the Son is equal and not less than the Father then he has equal attributes and is thus of equal divinity. This is an example of how Cyril presented his argument. If the Father is almighty, and the Son is likewise almighty, how is he lesser than Him? (εἰ παντοκράτωρ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατὴρ, παντοκράτωρ δὲ ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, πῶς ἐλάττων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν;)[371] Cyril repeated the same argument regarding lordship, light, life, and perfectness of the Son.[372] Again, he was dealing with titles and how each title contributes to understanding the Father through the Son while at the same time asserting the Son's divinity.[373]

Cyril repeatedly contended that to know the Father is to know the Son; meanwhile, although we know the Father through the Son, at the same time we have to recognize that each is different from the other. Further still,

---

[369] *In Jo.* 2:21. Ps 50:6–8.

[370] *In Jo.* 2.21. Deut 18: 15–18.

[371] *In Jo.* 1.36.

[372] Ibid.

[373] Other early Church writers, such as Origen also followed the same argument. Origen, as well as Cyril, discussed the titles of the Son beginning with the title of "Word" and gave great attention to the title "Light" among other titles. He discussed the titles of the Son beginning with the title of "Word" and others like "Light" which took great attention from Origen, as well as Cyril. Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, translated by Ronal Heine. The Fathers of the Church, vol, 80 (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 59–94.

the individuality of each person is to be understood within the unity of the Trinity. The constant complexity of unity while maintaining the individuality of each person, and asserting that each sheds light on the other's qualities and understanding is a theme that recurs in Cyril's work quite often. Therefore, in speaking about the unity and at the same time the individuality of the persons of the Trinity, Cyril expressed his ideas in the following way. Cyril found an opportunity to speak about the nature of faith when he comments on Jn 14:1 *believe in God, believe also in me*. He said, that in this verse, Christ has included the faith in God to include the faith in the Son. If we do not acknowledge the Son and do not include the name of the Son in our faith, it appears that we have not accepted the injunction of evangelic preaching (κηρυγμάτων εὐαγγελικῶν ἐπίταγμα φαίνεται).[374] In order to have a complete faith, one has to believe in the Father and in the Son and the Holy Spirit. Moreover, belief in the Son must include belief in his Incarnation. Cyril once again reaffirmed the individuality of each person of the Trinity and writes, "the holy and consubstantial Trinity's peculiar nature is distinguished by both the distinction of names and the quality of the persons."[375] For the Father is Father and not Son, and vice versa; and the same is pertinent to the Holy Spirit. We believe in one God but at the same time we must explain our faith and attribute to each person of the Trinity the same glory.[376] Cyril was explaining that faith in God must include that of the Son, together with the Holy Spirit. If the Son is not included then we have deviated from the evangelic preaching—the kerygma—handed down to us. This teaching includes a clear acknowledgment of the Son and his Incarnation.

Cyril insisted that each person of the Trinity should be given the same glory because this confirms the equal divinity of the Son to that of the Father. When Cyril comments on Jn 17: 4–5, *I glorified you on earth by finishing the work that you gave me to do. So now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed*, he explained how the Son carried out the work of salvation (*finishing the work*) and how this does not mean a separate essence of each person. That is to say, while acknowledging the distinctiveness of each person we recognize the unity of the Trinity. Cyril wrote that the Son did the "work" not as a servant or a creature assigned work but as the power and wisdom of the Father who is

---

374 *In Jo.* 2.400–1.

375 *In Jo.* 2.401. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἁγία τε καὶ ὁμοούσιος Τριὰς, καὶ ταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων διαφοραῖς καὶ τῶν προσώπων ποιότησί τε καὶ ἰδιότησι διαστέλλεται.

376 Ibid.

entrusted to accomplish the work. When one reads "O God command your strength," (Ps 67:28 LXX) one's understanding might lead to a duality of persons (καὶ προσώπων δυάδα παρενεγκὼν), the one who commands and the one who is commanded.[377] Then the verse unites both, the commander and the one commanded, to their natural unity when it continues "strengthen, O God, this which you have wrought in us." The Son is then entrusted with the work. Cyril gave two examples about the sun and fire. The sun sheds light to illuminate the world and the fire gives heat. However, no one suggested that the ray and the light are servants to the sun or the burning power as servant to the fire, for each of the two operates through its own innate nature (ἐνεργεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἑκάτερον δι᾽ ὧν ἔχει φυσικῶς τὰ οἰκεῖα).[378] If it appears that each is working on their own (αὐτουργὰ) yet they are distinct in nature.[379] What has been said about the sun and fire can be applied to the Father and the Son. When we read about the work of the Father and the Son it should be understood in a relationship of each being distinct but inseparable.

Cyril wrote on many occasions about the "work" of the Son. The major work that is entrusted to the Son is the Incarnation and saving the world. On every occasion when it was possible to write about the Incarnation Cyril was ready to do so. When Cyril commented on Jn 14:31, *but I do as the Father has commanded me, so that the world may know that I love the Father*, he began to explain the command that he obeyed in love of the Father. The command is to save humanity. When Athanasius wanted to explain the Incarnation and the story of our salvation, he began with Adam and the creation story. He defended his approach by saying that we cannot understand the reason for the Incarnation if we do not understand the origin of man and his transgression, because we are the object of the Incarnation and for our salvation the Word appeared in human form.[380] Cyril followed the same course of thought. He began to explain the command of God beginning with the story of Adam. Adam suffered the divine curse (τῆς θείας ἀρᾶς) of death by breaking the commandments.[381] Adam was justly punished for his transgression, but the second Adam, that is Christ, underwent suffering on our behalf though there was no guile in

[377] *In Jo.* 2.674.
[378] *In Jo.* 2.676.
[379] Ibid.
[380] Athanasius *di incarnatione* 4 & 5.
[381] *In Jo.* 2.529.

his mouth (1 Pet 2:22).[382] This was done through his love of the Father; the Son took the form of a man, though he is equal to God, and died to save the world. The Son, being the power of the Father himself, accomplished the command to suffer death of the flesh through the love of the Father. By his death, he would destroy the power of destruction, give life to those who suffered destruction, and renew (ἀνανεῶσαι) them to their ancient state of glory.[383] The Son accomplishes and works the command of salvation given by the Father through his Incarnation. By being in the form of man he was

[382] The theme that Christ is the second Adam is discussed in detail in R. L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind. A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971), 93–200. Cyril's aim or σκοπός of presenting the Adam typology was to highlight the idea of the newness of life. Wilken addressed the issue of the "newness of life" but not as the σκοπός of the typology as Cyril intended but as a byproduct of the typology. Wilken points out that "Cyril often describes the renewal of mankind as a return to that which was in the beginning. Just as he often speaks of the renewal to that which is 'better.' It is clear that he does not mean a *return* to the original state, but a new state brought about through Christ." This new state offers man with gifts that were not in the possession of the first Adam. Wilken, *Judaism and Christian Mind*, 90, 117. Wilken also pointed to some of Athanasius' suggestive comments regarding the Second Adam typology. Ibid., 104. In addition, he traced back the tradition of renewal and re-creation found in Athanasius as the starting point for Cyril. Ibid., 167. Wilken also notes that there is no detailed "study of the Adam-Christ typology in Cyril's works." Ibid., 108. Wilken comments that there are different terms that had been used to represent the idea of renewal like "re-creation, renewal, transformation, restoration." Ibid., 115. He writes that "The thread [of transformation] first appeared in Cyril's commentary on John 4:24 where he said that the new life in worship and in truth was a remodeling or transformation of the old way of life which had been governed by the law. The corollary to this idea is Cyril's conviction that the new life in Christ is superior to the old life under the law. These two terms summarize the whole of Cyril's attitude towards the relationship between Christianity and Judaism. Judaism has been *transformed* through the coming of Christ and the result is *superior* to what was before." Ibid., 88–89. The idea of "renewal" is a major theme in Cyril's thought, and beginning from John 17 onward the theme is highlighted because of the theme of resurrection and the accomplishment of Christ's salvation that brings renewal to humanity. The topic of "renewal" in Cyril's thought is a theme that recurs again as part of the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. Ladner has mentioned the idea of renewal in Cyril's theology in Gerhart B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform* (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1967), 79–81. Also, Daniel Keating, "The Baptism of Jesus in Cyril of Alexandria: The Re-creation of the Human Race," *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 201–222.

[383] *In Jo.* 2.530.

able to destroy death and renew humanity to its ancient glory. These words can be considered the explanation of Athanasius' famous phrase "God became man so that we may become gods." In what follows, we will pay close attention to Cyril's explanation of the Incarnation, being the work of the Father done through the Son. Furthermore, we will again look to the constant influence of Athanasius on Cyril's understanding of the Incarnation.

Cyril continually posed the question concerning the aim (σκοπόν) of the Incarnation.[384] Being in the form of God, he emptied himself and took the form of a servant (Phil 2:6,7) so that, through the Incarnation, the depth of our salvation will be exposed and will be seen at once according to what is permissible to us. The Incarnation revealed and set before us the possibility of salvation. Having established this point, Cyril wrote that one cause of the Incarnation was revealed by Paul when he wrote, *as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth* (Eph 1:10). That means reuniting things as they were in the beginning. Two methods of reuniting things are suggested, one according to Rom 8:3–4, and the other according to Heb 2:14,15. In Romans, the epistle discusses that the Law could not fulfill salvation because of the weakness of the flesh; therefore, God sent his own Son to condemn the sin in the flesh. In Hebrews, Christ, through death, brought death to naught and delivered us from bondage. In addition, in Jn 1:11–13, He came to his own and those who received him, he made them children of God. Based on these three verses, Cyril concluded that the three aims for the Incarnation were to condemn sin in the flesh, to overcome death by his death, and to make us children of God by which we receive a regeneration in the Spirit (ἀναγεννήσας ἐν Πνεύματι).[385]

Cyril not only explained the aim of the Incarnation, he also attempted to explain the Incarnation itself. *And the Word became flesh* (Jn 1:14), is the clearest statement about the Incarnation that the Evangelist has written. The Word became flesh signifies nothing else than the Word became Man. Cyril based his argument on Joel 2:28, *I will pour out my spirit on all flesh* where it is very clear that by "flesh" is meant the whole of the human being including the soul since we comprehend the whole from the part (ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ μέρους τὸ ὅλον συλλαβὼν).[386] Cyril followed this with more explanation. He noted that man is a composite (σύνθετον) rational (λογικὸν) creature.

---

[384] *In Jo.* 2.481.
[385] *In Jo.* 2. 481–2.
[386] *In Jo.* 1.138.

He is clearly composed of a soul and a perishable and earthly flesh (ἐκ ψυχῆς δηλονότι καὶ τῆς ἐπικήρου ταυτησὶ καὶ γηΐνης σαρκός).[387] This

[387] Ibid. Cyril elsewhere emphasized the presence of the soul within the understanding of the word "flesh-σάρξ." He mentions in Jn 8:12, *I am the light of the world*, that the light is not "in him" but the light is "him," for *I am the light*. The basis of this is that we cannot divide Christ into two sons after the Incarnation, one is the Son of God and the other is the man in the flesh. But there is *One Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor 8:6. We cannot sever the Son for he took the body as his own (αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ σῶμα). *In Jo.* 1.713. Cyril concluded the whole argument by writing that when we say that the Son of God became flesh we do not say that he was encompassed in flesh (σαρκὶ περιβεβλῆσθαί) for when we use the word flesh we indicate the whole man (τὸν πάντα δηλοῦμεν ἄνθρωπον). *In Jo.* 1.713. In Jn 7:27 Cyril made a similar statement that Christ is wearing his own robe, that is, his own body or his temple, does really signify a soul and a body (ἐκ ψυχῆς δηλονότι καὶ σώματος). *In Jo.* 1.442. Again, he asserted in Jn 6:57 that when we speak about the Incarnation of the Son of God, we mean a complete man was made (ἄνθρωπον ὁλοκλήρως), that is, he is man in all that entails. In spite of this clear assertion from Cyril that σάρξ includes a soul, scholarly works have argued lengthily on this point. Grillmeier argued that Arius denied a soul for Christ. Grillmeier also stated that Christ's soul was not a crucial issue until the Council of Nicea. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 239–40. Grillmeier adds that Athanasius has acknowledged that Christ has a soul but it has neither a "theological factor" nor a "physical factor." Ibid., 308–9. According to Grillmeier, Athanasius, after the Council of 362, recognized that the soul of Christ is physical but has no theological factor. Ibid., 320–323. As for Cyril, he took Athanasius' stand, Christ has a soul, it is physical but has no theological factor. Ibid., 414–7. Burghardt defends the presence of a soul in Christ by saying how could Cyril write that "what has not been assumed has not been saved" if he did not believe that Christ had a soul. Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 107. The problem with Burghardt's argument is that this quote, that is based on Gregory Nazianzen's Letter 101, is quoted in the comment on *In Jo.* 2.318, Book 7 which is collected from fragments. Liébaert argued that the fragments are not Cyril's words while Hallman argued that they are authentic. Further study needs to be done to determine if there is an interpolation in the fragments on Jn 7:27,28. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 131*ff*. Joseph M. Hallman, "The Seed of Fire: Divine Sufferings in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius of Constantinople," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1977): 377. Ng, in his article about St Athanasius, reaches a conclusion that "we find that while the evidence supporting Athanasius' recognition of Christ's human soul are not conclusive, the arguments for rejecting it are even weaker." Nathan K. K. Ng, "The Soul of Christ in Athanasius," *Coptic Church Review* 22 (Spring 2001): 23. Also A. Louth, "The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' *Contra Gentes – De Incarnatione*," Studia Patristica 13 (1975): 227–231. McKinion argued the presence of a soul from a philosophical point of view. He explained the Aristotelian and Stoic

vision of human beings. He said that the Neo-Platonists are a synthesis of both visions, thus, their belief is that the pneuma pervades and mixes with the whole body, thus, Cyril, as a Neo-Platonist, must have included in his Logos-Sarx Christology the presence of a soul. Steven A. McKinion, *Words, Imagery and the Mystery of Christ: A Reconstruction of Cyril of Alexandria's Christology* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 55–59. After McKinion argued his idea philosophically he addressed the issue from scripture and said that scriptural ethos spoke of ἄνθρωπος as σάρξ and asserted that Cyril asserts the presence of a human soul in Christ. He also used, within his argument, the idea that Cyril mentioned that what was not assumed is not saved which we have previously discussed as debatable. Ibid., 159–175. Liébaert approached the topic of the presence of a soul in Christ from the standpoint of development in the thought and writings of Cyril. He first discussed the philosophical view that there are two possible understandings of becoming man. The Aristotelian which considered it a union between the soul and a body and the Platonists who considered man a spiritual being engaged in a body. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 147–148. Liébaert argued that Athanasius did not include a soul in his system and it was strictly a σάρξ image. According to Liébaert, this image is the prevalent Platonist idea and was adopted by Didymus the Blind and Apollinarius. This is in contrast to Eustathius of Antioch and his followers who insisted on the human soul to Christ. Ibid., 149–150. Liébaert argued, after quoting Cyril's explicit reference to soul in his writings, that Cyril's thought was in line with the current Platonist anthropology that man is an incarnate spirit and the soul was not part of the framework of thought in the system. He also argued that the soul did not play any part in the Anti-Arian polemics. Based on this Liébaert concluded that Cyril's works before 428 did not include reference to the soul. Ibid., 155–8. The mention of soul comes later in his writings. Ibid., 171–2, 184. Liébaert's argument does not accord with the cited reference to the soul in the *Commentary on John* mentioned above. The Commentary is one of his early writings and is pre-Nestorian. The presence of soul in Cyril's writings is evident in his early writings and the theory of idea development does not hold. Hallman asserted that the use of σάρξ does include human soul and based his argument on Jn 1:14 interpretation. Hallman wrote that Cyril uses σῶμα twice and σάρξ twenty-seven times in the *Thesaurus*; thus, his use of σάρξ does include the soul. Hallman, 373. Koen argued that a division of modern scholarship into a Logos-sarx and Logos-anthropos Christology is rather exaggerated. Lars Koen, *The Saving Passion*, 19. Koen is of the opinion that "Grillmeier is also satisfied with observing the similarity between Athanasius and Cyril and finds them both lacking in an understanding of the real humanity of Christ. He gives priority to a Logos-sarx-christology to the apparent exclusion of other aspects of Cyril's christology." Ibid., 36. The presence of the soul in Christ must be understood within a larger context of the Incarnation and salvation where Christ has to assume humanity in its totality in order to be saved. McCoy writes that "Cyril argued that when one speaks of a man the reference is to a soul and a body together, though the soul is of another nature than the body." J.

perishable and corruptible flesh was sealed up with the spirit of life (κατεσφραγίζετο τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ζωῆς).[388] This spirit of life is of the divine and makes us benefit from the divine goodness. When we transgressed and received the punishment of returning to dust then the earthly body suffered the departure of the spirit of life and this was death. It was the death of the flesh alone, for the soul was kept in immortality, since the punishment was limited to the flesh since it was the flesh that was to return to dust. The way to recover (ἀνασώζεσθαι) what was lost is for the flesh to intertwine (συμπλοκῇ) again with life and regain our immortality. The means to achieve this is to unite this mortal body with the Word that gives life to all things (τῷ τὰ πάντα ζωογονοῦντι Λόγῳ).[389] For he is Life and when he is united with the flesh he will bring forth (ἐνεργάσασθαι) good in the flesh, that is, life.

D. McCoy, "Philosophical Influences on the Doctrine of the Incarnation in Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria," *Encounter* 38 (1977): 381. Welch, in his article, addressed the topic of the soul of Christ. Welch comments on Cyril's *De recta fide ad Theodosium* saying, "Cyril continues on to say that Christ laid down his own soul for our soul, 'in order to be the Lord of the living and the dead,' and that Christ's soul was offered as ransom for our souls. It was the soul of Christ that descended into hell, preached to the imprisoned spirits and bestowed the power of the divine sovereignty over hell. Cyril quotes 1 Peter 3:17–20 and concludes that the passage must refer to the soul of the Logos. There is no room in his thought for the idea that the divinity separated from the humanity at the death of Christ." Lawrence J. Welch, "Logos-Sarx? Sarx and the Soul of Christ in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 291. The beginning of Welch's article includes a summary of scholarly works concerning the topic of the soul in Christ. Ibid., 271–276. Dratsellas also presented a summary of scholarly works that dealt with the topic of the presence of a soul of Christ. Dratsellas believed that Cyril is a biblical theologian and in biblical terminology "sarx" meant the whole of human nature. Dratsellas, "Questions on Christology," 204–8. Dratsellas argued that the *Thesaurus*, one of the early writings of Cyril, uses clear terminology about the soul in Christ. Ibid., 209. He strongly disagreed with Grillmeier about the young Cyril's use of the Logos-Sarx Christology. Ibid., 213. Also consult Maurice F. Wiles, "The Nature of the Early Debate about Christ's Human Soul," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965):139–51. Further detailed interest in the topic of the soul of Christ in the writings of Cyril can begin with the Dratsellas and Welch articles that include a summary of major works regarding this topic.

[388] *In Jo.* 1.138.

[389] *In Jo.* 1.139.

Cyril added that the Evangelist did not say that the Word came into (ἐλθεῖν) flesh but became (γενέσθαι) actual flesh.[390] The difference is that the former would be the case of prophets and saints and the latter would be the case of the Word Incarnate. Therefore, he is God by nature in flesh and with flesh and having it as his own (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Θεός ἐστι κατὰ φύσιν ἐν σαρκὶ, καὶ μετὰ σαρκὸς, ὡς ἰδίαν ἔχων αὐτὴν). He is worshiped in this flesh and with this flesh (καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ σὺν αὐτῇ προσκυνούμενος).[391] God is in him without separating the flesh of the Word and there is no other God than him. He unites the flesh to the Word and makes it his own (ἴδιον αὐτοῦ). For Christ is one from both (εἷς γὰρ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὁ Χριστός).[392] Cyril maintained the unity of the flesh with the Word on earth, where Christ is one and in heaven, where the glorified flesh shares in the worship due to God. This is an affirmation that when Christ took the flesh as his own, he recovered what was lost—that is, its previous glory—and thus the Christ will be worshiped in and with the flesh. The theological framework within which Cyril is working is embedded within the idea of the oneness of the person of Christ and the oneness of the Trinity. The Incarnation is becoming actual flesh and having the flesh as his own. The flesh, according to Cyril, is composed of a soul, a perishable and earthly flesh, and a spirit of life. Jeopardizing this understanding of the Incarnation nullifies salvation.

Cyril commented on Jn 3:35, *The Father loves the Son and has placed all things in his hands*, by noting that the proof of the Father's love is that he gave the Son all power and authority. The same idea is found in Mt 9:27 and Mt 28:18. This does not imply that the Son is lesser than the Father for having to receive it. For the Son is equal to the Father and has all power. Nevertheless, when he became man and humbled himself, he then received humanly (ἀνθρωπίνως) what was his, as God (θεοπρεπῶς), for it is a restoration and recovery (ἐπαναδρομὴ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐπανάληψις) with the

---

[390] *In Jo.* 1.140. This is a direct answer to the Nestorian controversy, though Cyril wrote this text before he even became a bishop. So, the Nestorian controversy did not make Cyril rethink his opinions, he just became outspoken and defensive about them. Another possibility is that the Nestorian opinion did not come from a vacuum. Nestorius' training in the Antiochene school of thought made him develop his controversial ideas and it is most probable that Cyril, because of his acutely trained theological sense, considered this a point to be addressed lest it would lead to heresy, which it actually later did.

[391] *In Jo.* 1.140.

[392] Ibid.

flesh of what he had before the flesh.[393] It is as if it is an attestation of the divine powers within the Incarnate Logos and assurance that what he had before being in the flesh did not change after assuming the flesh.

Cyril explained that Christ did not receive the Spirit for himself, but rather in himself for us (ἡμῖν δὲ μᾶλλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ) for all good things are quickly transmitted from him to us.[394] Since Adam disobeyed and sinned and since through him the whole of human nature lost the God-given good (τὸ θεόσδοτον ἀγαθὸν), the human race needed the Word, who knows no turning (ὁ τροπὴν οὐκ εἰδὼς), to become man, so that through him goodness would be preserved firmly in human nature.[395] The reason we need the Word is to reverse the action of Adam. As Adam sinned by turning from goodness to evil, the Son who is unchangeable—for he is the one who does not sin—is the one who could firmly secure the goodness in us. Therefore the Son, as man, would indisputably preserve in himself (διέσωσας ἀναμφιλόγως ἐν σεαυτῷ), the holy anointing, that is, the Spirit (ἅγιον χρίσμα τουτέστι τὸ Πνεῦμα).[396] The Only-Begotten became man, like us, so as to strongly guard (ἀραρότως τῇ φύσει φυλάττοιτο) in human nature the good things and root the grace of the Spirit (ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ῥιζωθεῖσα χάρις) within it.[397] Knowing that the Son, being of God's nature, is unchangeable (ἀμετάπτωτον), he can instill in humanity his unchangeableness and thus reverse the changeableness of Adam. This is the way to reverse the first loss of goodness that humanity lost in Adam by instilling in humanity the newness of life (καινότητα ζωῆς) and return to incorruption. After the Incarnation he was man and one of us (ἦν ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν) and after the resurrection, humanity was given the renewing Spirit (τὸ ἀνακαινίζον Πνεῦμα), where Christ lived again having the whole of human nature in himself.[398] Renewal of humanity could not have been achieved without the Son who, having taken human nature as his own, was able to reverse the first change towards sin incurred by Adam and establish a newness of life within humanity.

---

[393] *In Jo.* 1.256.

[394] *In Jo.* 1.693.

[395] For a discussion about the relationship between the unchangeableness of God, even after the Incarnation, with the divine impassability refer to David B. Hart, "No Shadow of Turning: On Divine Impassibility," *Pro Ecclesia* vol. 11, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 184–206.

[396] *In Jo.* 1.694.

[397] Ibid.

[398] Ibid.

Cyril explained the same idea again when he comments on Jn 17:33, *In the world you face persecution. But take courage: I have conquered the world*, to elaborate upon Christ's conquering of the world. Christ conquered every sin and will thus freely give (ἐπιδώσει) victory for those who attempt to struggle for his sake.[399] Christ not only conquered corruption and death, making his resurrection the beginning of a new life, but through the power of his resurrection he will also overcome the world. For Christ overcame the world as man, humanity will thus be empowered to overcome the world through the power of his resurrection.[400]

To understand how the Incarnate Son of God conquered we have to hold before our minds the Son who is at the same time God and man (Θεὸν ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπον ὄντα τὸν Υἱὸν).[401] Christ bears in his person the nature of the one Son; at the same time we cannot cast aside the manner befitting humanity (τὰ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι πρέποντα). For example, we cannot ignore the death of Christ considering it foreign to his nature since he is the one who gives life to all. He endured death in the flesh since all flesh is mortal. However, in the scheme of redemption he gave up his body for death, where he implanted his own life into it (αὐτῷ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐνεφύτευσε ζωὴν), and did not exert any powerful means to rescue himself from death.[402] For his incarnation was for the sole reason to give human nature the ability to escape death and return to the original state of incorruption. He achieved this through sanctification. Earthly bodies (γῆς σῶμα) do not have the fruit of sanctification in their own nature (φύσεως μὲν ἰδίας οὐκ ἔχει καρπὸν τὸν ἁγιασμὸν) therefore humanity was in need of God who is by nature prone to sanctify all things (τοῦ ἁγιάζειν τὰ πάντα πεφυκότος Θεοῦ).[403] The Word who dwells within himself, sanctifies the temple of his dwelling through the Holy Spirit (τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικήσαντος Λόγου διὰ τοῦ Ἁγιοῦ Πνεύματος τὸν οἰκεῖον ναὸν ἁγιάζοντος) and alters his own nature by his energy (καὶ εἰς ἐνέργειαν αὐτὸν τῆς ἰδίας μεταποιοῦντος φύσεως).[404] Thus, the Son is able to incur sanctification within himself through his own power and by the energy embedded within him, and

[399] *In Jo.* 2.657.

[400] This is a recurring theme in Cyril's writing where he comments on Jn 13:36 that Christ's suffering is the first to bring release (λύσις) from death and his resurrection is marked as the beginning of courage (εὐτολμίας) to attain the newness of life. *In Jo.* 2.393–4.

[401] *In Jo.* 2.725.

[402] *In Jo.* 2.726.

[403] Ibid.

[404] Ibid.

through this process of sanctification he is able to implant the sanctifying power within humanity.[405] Christ sanctified his own temple—since it is created—through which he is able to sanctify all created things. When the Son anoints his own temple for sanctification it is understood that the Father is said to do so for the Father works through no other person except through his Son (ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ οὐχ ἑτέρως ἤ δι᾽ Υἱοῦ).[406] This is really another way of explaining Athanasius' noteworthy statement, "God became man so that we may become gods." Christ took a body and sanctified it, and it is through this sanctified body he implants the fruit of sanctification in humanity and achieves deification.

Cyril summarized his understanding of Christ's death when commenting on Christ being taken to be crucified (Jn 14:16–18) and further writes that the death of Christ accomplished a reversal (ἀντίστροφον) in the situation of humanity. The death of Christ was a source of renewal of humanity to a newness of life (καινότητα ζωῆς) without corruption.[407] Again, Cyril was following the same theme of the return (ἀντίστροφον) of humanity to its original state, even better, to a state of incorruption.

Cyril did not, at any stage of the commentary, give special attention to the issue of knowledge or ignorance of Christ. He commented that it is written in Luke that Jesus advanced in wisdom and grace (᾽Ιησοῦς δὲ προέκοπτεν ἐν σοφίᾳ καὶ χάριτι) while the Spirit said somewhere else that the Son has his glory full of grace (ὅτι πλήρη χάριτος ἔχειν τὴν δόξαν ... τὸν Υἱὸν).[408] The last statement acknowledges Christ's fullness in grace and glory, and there is nothing beyond that, so how can the Lukan verse still attribute more growth in wisdom and grace? Cyril explained that growth is

---

[405] Hallman writes that Cyril after arguing against the Arians and proving the divinity of the Son, "Cyril asserts that the human nature is perfected by the divine Word." Hence any moral development or growth in wisdom of Christ mentioned in the Gospel narrative is through "the gradual elevation of the humanity of Jesus by the Logos." Hallman, *The Seed of Fire*, 373. Hallman does not go further in his discussion about the perfection of humanity through the Son who has acquired a body or humanity as his own.

[406] *In Jo.* 2.727.

[407] *In Jo.* 3.80.

[408] *In Jo.* 1.143–4. It is worth noting that the New Testament Nestle Aland text has καὶ ᾽Ιησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις where stature (ἡλικίᾳ) is not mentioned in Cyril's text. The Nestle Aland edition does not mention any other variant reading for this word in other manuscripts. Cyril mentioned the non-tangible attributes such as wisdom and grace while the physical growth in stature is not mentioned.

in the eyes of those who saw his works and marveled at him. The spectators experienced an increase in knowledge of Christ. The increase was in those who saw him, not in himself. This explanation clarifies why Cyril either omitted stature (ἡλικίᾳ) or it may be that his text did not have ἡλικίᾳ and this consequently influenced his exegesis.

When Christ went to raise Lazarus in Jn 11:33–4 he asked where did Lazarus lay? Cyril explained that this should not be considered ignorance of the Son, but rather should be considered equality with the Father who called on Adam saying, *Where are you?* (Gen 3:9). Cyril claimed that this question would gather the crowds around Lazarus to witness the miracle of restoring life.[409] On another occasion, two of John's disciples follow Christ and he says to them, *What are you looking for?* (Jn 1:38). Cyril again noted that Christ is not ignorant (ἀγνοήσας) for as God he knows all things. He rather asks the question to begin a discourse (διαλέξεσι).[410] When the crowds in Jerusalem began whispering among themselves *Is not this the man whom they are trying to kill?* (Jn 7:25) and when Christ teaches in the temple saying, *You know me, and you know where I am from* (Jn 7:28), Cyril commented that Christ said the last statement in answer to the whispers of the crowds, for he has knowledge (τὴν γνῶσιν) of all things spoken.[411] When Christ knew that the Pharisees heard that he baptized more than John, he left Judea (Jn 4:1–3). Cyril commented that this signifies that Christ had foreknowledge of what was happening, since he knew in himself (αὐτομάτως οἶδεν) and did not wait for someone to tell him.[412] Cyril concluded that it is worthy of God's befitting economy (θεοπρεποῦς οἰκνομίας ἄξιον) to leave Judea.[413] In all of these references, Cyril continually asserted that God is all-knowledgeable and, consequently, the Incarnate Son of God is also all-knowledgeable. Cyril did not divide the knowledge of Christ in such a way that knowledge belongs to the divinity and ignorance belongs to humanity. Rather, Christ is all-knowledgeable as God, and he answers questions or leaves an area, as is befitting the economy. This is not because his humanity is ignorant, but because it is befitting to take action that is more suitable to the economy.[414]

---

[409] *In Jo.* 2.280–1.

[410] *In Jo.* 1.193.

[411] *In Jo.* 1.655.

[412] *In Jo.* 1.261.

[413] Ibid.

[414] Both Du Manoir and Liébaert gave some attention to the ignorance of Christ in the *Commentary on John*. Du Manoir tried to answer the question, is the ignorance of Christ real or apparent? He answers the question that the divinity does not need progress but it is the divine knowledge that appeared progressively in his

Just as Cyril did not divide the knowledge or ignorance of Christ into human ignorance and divine knowledge, he did not divide the nature of Christ into two, but rather maintained the unity under all circumstances. The issue of the unity of the Son later became the main focus of controversy in Cyril's Christology. At the time of writing his commentary—which, as I have argued in Chapter One, was before his becoming bishop and before the beginning of the Nestorian controversy—he was extremely adamant about the unity in Christ. Because of the importance of the issue of unity, we will now address the unity of Christ as presented in the *Commentary on John*.

Cyril comments on Jn 6:53, *Very truly, I tell you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you*, that Christ hands down to his disciples the "life giving knowledge of the mystery" (τὴν ζωοποιὸν τοῦ μυστηρίου γνῶσιν).[415] Cyril alerted his readers that Christ intentionally withheld knowledge of how he would give them his flesh to eat because the disciples had first to believe before they were called to seek and inquire about the mystery (ἐπὶ τὸ χρῆναι πιστεύειν πρὸ τῆς ἐρεύνης καλεῖ).[416] For Christ did not explain in detail how humanity is to partake of the flesh and blood of himself before the Last Supper when he explained to his disciples that this is a new covenant. The explanation of the mystery was given to the few who believed. Therefore, those who have not accepted the faith in Christ are told that they are going to be deprived of the

---

humanity. He also thought that Cyril responded to the problem of ignorance in his post-Nestorian works. Du Manoir, *Dogme*, 150–154. Du Manoir gave a summary of scholarship concerning the ignorance of Christ on p154–7. Liébaert was of the opinion that Cyril changed his mind and maintained that God is perfect and does not need progress in wisdom! Liébaert, *La doctrine*, p 138–143. Liébaert also provided a summary of scholarship regarding the ignorance of Christ. Ibid., 87–101. Koen asserted that Cyril admits the ignorance of Christ in the *Commentary on John*. Koen, *The Saving Passion*, 27. Smith compared some Cyrillian manuscripts concerning Christ's growing in wisdom as mentioned in Lk 2 and comments as follows: "all [manuscripts] affirming that our Lord's increase in wisdom, stature, and grace cannot be said of Him considered as the Word, but either must be understood of the increase of admiration on the part of all who beheld Him, and daily witnessed a fuller manifestation of His glory; or, as the two latter extracts teach, it refers to the human nature." *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith (Studion, 1983), 65. This opinion confirms Du Manoir's conclusion. Also A. M. Dubarle, "L'ignorance du Christ dans S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 16 (1939):111–120.

[415] *In Jo.* 1.528.

[416] *In Jo.* 1.529.

sanctification and blessedness of life (τῆς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ μακαριότητι ζωῆς) for they will not partake of Jesus' mystical blessing (οἱ διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογιάς οὐ παραδεξάμενοι τὸν᾽Ιησοῦν).[417] The Word is life by nature, and his body (σῶμα) is also quickening since it is united with the all-quickening Word (ἑνωθὲν τῷ τὰ πάντα ζωογνονοῦτι Λόγῳ).[418] After the Incarnation, the body and the Word are indivisible (ἀδιαίρετος γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν).[419] The body is not of the same nature as the Word but they came together to be one in union and in an incomprehensible agreement (ἓν δὶ τῇ συνόδῳ καὶ τῇ ἀπαερινοήτῳ συνδρομῇ).[420] Cyril then proceeded to explain the force of this unity. The body is not an instrument of the Word, nor is it obeying orders, rather, the body is united in complete agreement with the Word, that as the Word is life giving, so is the body of Christ life giving.[421] The life-giving attributes of the body are shown in the

[417] Ibid.

[418] Ibid.

[419] Ibid.

[420] *In Jo.* 1.530.

[421] Cyril did not consider the body of Christ an instrument, because of its unity with the Logos it becomes one Christ. This body of the one Christ has a life-giving power; therefore, it cannot be considered an instrument but of one and the same Christ. If the body is an instrument, how can we account for Cyril's understanding of salvation where Christ sanctifies his body through which humanity is sanctified. Human sanctification does not lead our bodies to be instruments to our souls. Modern scholarship has given much attention to the idea of Christ's body as an instrument. The whole argument is based on two quotes from Athansius' works: *de incarnatione* 44 and *Contra Arianius* 3:35. In these references Athanasius used the word ὄργανον. Du Manoir noted that Thomas Aquinas has often used the terms *instrumentum, organum* in his writings. Du Manoir added that Janssens, based on Aquinas' use, has gathered many of Aquinas' works citing Cyril's work. Du Manoir, *Dogme*, 139. It is most probable that the influence of Aquinas on Catholic theology shaped their approach and focused their attention to the term ὄργανον. Grillmeier discusses the issue of the body as instrument in the context of the Logos-Sarx Christology. If Athanasius, according to Grillmeier, suggests that Christ has a sarx without a soul, then it is most probable that the body is an instrument since it is devoid of soul. Grillmeier, 317–8. However, this research demonstrated that the sarx includes a soul. Fraigneau-Julien concludes his article that the body of Christ is "comme organe physique de la divinité." B. Fraigneau-Julien, "L'efficacité de l'humanité du Christ selon saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue Thomiste* 55 (1955) 628. McGuckin was more particular with his words and writes, "His [Christ] person was divine and could not be reduced to the bodily life, yet it elected to express itself through that bodily manner. As a result even the bodily life became a direct vehicle of the revelation of the divine." McGuckin intentionally chose "vehicle" instead of

Eucharistic mystery, for if we do not eat his flesh we cannot have life. The power of this mystery is proved and demonstrated by the ability of the flesh of Christ, when it was united with the Word, to be life-giving. The proof is in the raising of the dead, which was not done by word only (οὐ λόγῳ μόνον) or by command. Rather, there is a great stress on employing his flesh as a coworker (συνεργάτην) in the process of raising the dead.[422] The flesh has the power to be life-giving (ζωοποιεῖν δυναμένην) because it is made one with the Word (ὡς ἓν ἤδη γενομένην πρὸς αὐτόν).[423] This also asserts that it is truly his own body and not another's. Cyril demonstrated his point by the example of the daughter of the chief of the synagogue where, *he took her by the hand and called out, "Child, get up!"* (Lk 8:54). In this miracle he gave life by the power of the command as God and again

---

"instrument" to express his ideas. John McGuckin, "A Synopsis of St. Cyril's Christological Doctrine," *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998) 46. O'Keefe referred to Grillmeier's opinion without any comment. John O'Keefe, "Interpreting the Angel. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentators on the book of Malachi," (Ph.D. Diss., The Catholic University of America, 1993), 230. Koen presented both points of view of Christ's body as "his own" and as "an instrument." For the point of view of the body as an instrument he is dependent on Grillmeier Koen, 65. Liébaert wrote that the Incarnate Word performs his miracles διὰ τῆς σαρκός and writes that in addition to the body being an instrument it is also co-worker or co-operative (συνεργάτης) with the Logos. Liébaert, *La Doctrine*, 216. McKinion expressed a different opinion concerning the body of Christ as instrument. He writes: "The third component of Nestorius' συνάφεια which Cyril rejects is that God the Word has taken up an ordinary human being like us to use as his instrument (ὀργάνον) to provide redemption…. Cyril is intent on maintaining singleness of agent. In other words, the referent of the Incarnation must be the Word, both before and after become a human being. To say, as he accuses Nestorius of doing, that the Incarnation is the Word's assumption of an ordinary human being like us to utilize as his instrument is to deny the necessary singleness of agent…. If the body of Christ, which belongs to a human being assumed by the Word as his instrument, is not his, then he is not truly Son of God, but the Son using an ordinary human being, like the boy using the lyre…." McKinion, 100–1. Also McKinion, 146. McKinion was applying the notion of instrumentality from the post-Nestorian writings. This is the implication of accepting the instrumentality of the body even without Nestorius' influence. If the body is not his own but an instrument, then it could be another person's, it could be similar to the situation of the prophets, and if God could use a body as an instrument, then what is the significance of the Incarnation? The body must be "his own" in order to achieve the "newness of life" and the "new creation."

[422] *In Jo.* 1.530.

[423] Ibid.

through the touch of his holy flesh (διὰ τῆς ἁφῆς τῆς ἁγιας σαρκὸς) to show that it is one intrinsic operation through both (μίαν τε καὶ συγγενῆ δι᾽ ἀμφοῖν ἐπιδείκνυσι τὴν ἐνεργειαν).[424] Another example is that of the raising of the widow's son of Nain. He approached the dead son and *touched the bier* and he said, *young man, I say to you rise!* (Lk 7:14). Again, the operation of raising the dead included the power of the command of the Word and the touching of the bier. Cyril then concluded his exegesis by referring back to the power of the Eucharistic mystery saying that if the body that is one with Christ is life giving and raises the dead, surely we are also partaking of immortality when we partake of the mystery.[425] The unity as explained here, is not only a physically inseparable and indivisible unity. This unity also includes a unity in operation.

Likewise, when Cyril spoke of the healing of the blind man in Jn 9:6–7, he also connected the healing of the blind man to the life-giving ability of the body of Christ. In addition to the life-giving powers, Christ's body is also a patron of light (φωτισμοῦ πρόξενον) for he is by nature the true light.[426] Cyril again compares the healing of the blind man where Christ used his spittle in conjunction with the command to "go and wash," with the raising of the son of the widow where the command to "I say to you rise" is joined by touching the bier with his hand. This is another assertion that the body of Christ possesses a life-giving power in addition to its being a patron of light. Cyril's understanding of the Eucharistic mystery is based on his theological understanding of the Incarnation. The life-giving power

---

[424] Ibid.

[425] Ezra Gebremedhin, *Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria*, (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1977). Gebremedhin dedicated his research to the study of the vivifying power of the Eucharist, in the larger spectrum of Cyril's work beyond the scope of *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. However, here, our aim is to focus on the unifying factors of the humanity and the divinity of the Son which includes, in part, its vivifying power, since the Son is the Life of the world. Gebremedhin's study is an elaboration of this and is very relevant to this point. There are other articles on the Eucharist listed in the following three works: Burghardt, 113; in Daniel Keating, "The Baptism of Jesus in Cyril of Alexandria: The Re-creation of the Human Race," *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 544. And Mahé provides a summary of scholarly works on the Eucharist in J. Mahé, "L'Eucharistie d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'Histoire Écclésiastique* 8 (1907): 677–8. See also, Du Manoir, 185–203, where he includes a discussion about the real presence. McKinion, 208–212. Koen, 73. E. Michaud, "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'Eucharistie," *Revue Internationale de Théologie* 10 (1902):599–614, 675–692.

[426] *In Jo.* 2.158.

of the mystery is explained through Cyril's Christological expressions of the oneness of the person of Christ which includes unity of operation. Unity of operation excludes the body of Christ as an instrument and excludes duality in the person of Christ. When the Nestorian controversy erupted later, Cyril considered it a threat to the understanding of the person of Christ, the Incarnation, and consequently the understanding of the Eucharistic mystery. The Nestorian vision includes instrumentality of the body and duality of operation contrary to Cyril's vision of unity.

These ideas are represented in Athanasian writings. In St. Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* he writes, "…when there was need to raise Peter's wife's mother, who was sick of fever, He stretched forth His hand humanly, but He stopped the illness divinely. And in the case of the man blind from birth, human was the spittle which He gave forth from the flesh, but divinely did He open the eyes through the clay. And in the case of Lazarus, He gave forth a human voice, as man; but divinely, as God, did He raise Lazarus from the dead. These things were so done, were so manifested, because He had a body, not in appearance but in truth; and it became the Lord, in putting on human flesh, to put it on whole with the affections proper to it; that, as we say that the body was His own, so also we may say that the affections of the body were proper to Him alone, though they did not touch Him according to His Godhead."[427] There are two main Athanasian points that Cyril adopted. First, work done by the Incarnate Word is done through the cooperation between the Word and his body as one single activity. Second, the body is true and not "in appearance," addressing docetic opinions. Athanasius also addressed the truthfulness of the body of Christ in *de incarnatione* 18. Even after the Nestorian controversy, Cyril still kept the same ideas. His sermons on the Gospel of Luke portray similar ideas. He writes commenting on the miracle of raising the son of the woman of Nain, "And the manner of his rising is plain to see; *for He touched*, it says, *the bier, and said, young man, I say unto thee, arise.* And yet how was not a word enough for raising him who was lying there? For what is there difficult to it, or past accomplishment? What is more powerful than the Word of God? Why then did He not effect the miracle by a word only, but also touched the bier? It was, my beloved, that thou mightest learn that the holy body of Christ is effectual for the salvation of man. For the flesh of the Almighty Word is the body of life, and was clothed with His

[427] *Contra Arianos* 3.32.

might."[428] The continuity of the theological theme of unity of operation is evident.

Cyril explained that Jn 15:1, *I am the true vine*, refers directly to Christ and to no other, for he gives to those who believe in him his body and his blood that they might have in themselves eternal life. At the same time, eternal life might be conceived as the flesh of him who is the eternal life, that is, the Only Begotten. Since he is eternal life, then he is the one who raises us up on the last day. Cyril then proceeded to explain these statements in greater detail. Since Life, that is, the Son of God, took to himself flesh, his flesh is a transforming force of life (τὴν τῆς ζωῆς μετεχώρησε δύναμιν), and it is impossible that life be conquered by death (θανάτῳ νικᾶσθαι τὴν ζωήν).[429] Seeing that life is in us, the bonds of death cannot hold up, and life will gain victory over corruption. When Christ says, *I will raise him*, he not only conferred on his own flesh the power to raise from the dead, but also the Incarnate Word, being one with his own flesh (ἓν ὑπάρχων μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς), also says *I will raise him.*[430] For Christ cannot be divided into two sons, and his body cannot be foreign to the Only-Begotten, for the body does not neglect its own soul, nor does it consider it foreign.[431] If the unity between the Word and the body that he assumed as his own is not preserved, then the body of the Word will not have this vivifying effect in its wonder working nor will it have the force of vivifying in the rest of human bodies that it affects.

In Jn 19:23–24, the soldiers wanted to divide Christ's clothes among themselves. They divided the clothes into four parts, but when it came to the seamless tunic, they cast lots and did not divide the tunic. Cyril commented that it is impossible that scripture would address such details had it not been of benefit for the believers. To begin with, the readers would benefit by knowing that it is in fulfillment of a prophecy in the book of Psalms (Ps 22:18). This event is also a mystical sign (σημεῖον μυστικῆς).[432] The four parts of the garment signify the salvation of the four corners of the world. This is in comparison to the Only Begotten, whose body is cut into small pieces for the sanctification of every soul, yet he remains undivided and whole. Indeed, Cyril finds in every division and

---

[428] *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith (Studion, 1983), 155 & 201.

[429] *In Jo.* 2.543.

[430] Ibid.

[431] Ibid.

[432] *In Jo.* 3.88

unity, in any event of the scriptural narrative, a sign of the unity of the Christ.

Cyril never separated the body from the Word even at the time of the ascension. He wrote that we must not accept a divided Christ as some want to divide Christ into two (εἰς δύο καταμερίζεσθαι χριστοὺς).[433] Most probably he meant the general Antiochene tendency—a tendency that later led to the Nestorian controversy—to separate the humanity of Christ from his divinity. He went on to explain that Christ keeps himself undivided in every way after the Incarnation (ἀμέριστον γὰρ ἑαυτὸν πανταχῇ φυλάττει μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν).[434] *Then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before* (Jn 6:62), for in the situation, *where he was before*, the Word was without an earthly body (γῆς σώματος).[435] Paul says he is *one Lord Jesus Christ* (1 Cor 8:6), for he is one Son before and after the Incarnation, and his body should not be alien to the Word (οὐκ ἀλλότριον) for it is his own (τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ ... σῶμα).[436] Cyril refused the division of humanity from the divinity of Christ not only during his earthly ministry and during his performance of miraculous works, but this indivisibility was sustained even during his ascension.

Cyril not only insisted upon the unity of the Son during his ascension but also the preservation of this unity when he came down from heaven for, *No one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man* (Jn 3:13). Cyril writes, "for since the Word of God came down from heaven, he says the Son of Man came down from heaven, declining to divide into two persons after the Incarnation."[437] Since the verse writes the "Son of Man" is the one who descended, then he is no other than the Word of God. Even in the description of the descent there is no division of persons. Cyril added, for as he is the Word of God, he is also the Man of a woman, for there is one Christ of both, undivided in sonship and God deserving glory (εἷς δὲ λοιπὸν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀδιαίρετος εἰς υἱότητα καὶ εἰς δόξαν θεοπρεπῆ).[438] For Cyril, the indivisibility of Christ had to be preserved under all circumstances of the Incarnation and in the

---

[433] *In Jo.* 1.550.

[434] Ibid.

[435] Ibid.

[436] Ibid.

[437] *In Jo.* 1.224. τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ Λόγου καταβεβηκότος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώτου καταβῆναί φησι, διχάζεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν εἰς δύο πρόσωπα παραιτούμενος.

[438] Ibid.

process of the Incarnation as well. The indivisibility had to be kept during the ascension and later descent.

Cyril wanted to prove the indivisibility of the Word from his own body at all times. He repeated this idea in many forms. Therefore, he wrote that, while the Word was among us on earth, he still filled the heavens. So even now, while he is heaven with his own flesh (ἐν οὐρανοῖς μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς), he still fills the earth.[439] Though we might tend to think of him as present with us in his divinity, he speaks of being with us, *a little while*. This verse indicates the whole and perfect self without division (τελείως τε καὶ ὁλοκλήρως ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους σημαίνων)[440] so that no one would sever Christ into two sons for he is one Christ. We should think of the Word as being one with his temple, that is, his body. They are not of the same essence but after their ineffable union, we should not sever them, for Christ is one of both (εἷς γὰρ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὁ Χριστός).[441]

The indivisibility of the Incarnate Son must be understood within the Trinity. Cyril explained that the Son does not seek his own glory for it is in his power to incur immediate punishment since, *I do not seek my own glory; there is one who seeks it and he is the judge* (Jn 8:50). For those who insult him insult also the Godhead, and people should be careful of the Father's wrath. For if the Son is forbearing (ἀνεξικακοῦντος), the Father will not tolerate this and will rise against the insolent people.[442] This is not as if God is pleased to be on behalf of his saints, but rather being one with the Son, they both are co-glorified (συνδοξαζόμενόν).[443] As the Son partakes of the glory of the Father he also partakes of his essence. For he who slanders (δυσφημίας) against the Son, is impious (δυσσεβήσαντες) against the whole Trinity.[444] The indivisibility of the Son Incarnate is to be preserved not only within his own nature, but also within the Trinity.

When the blind man in Jn 9:37 was asked if he believes in the Son of Man and he replied asking *who is he to believe in him*, *Jesus said to him, "You have seen him, and the one speaking with you is he."* Cyril instantly proceeded to explain that the answer makes us understand the aim or object (σκοπὸν) of the Incarnation.[445] We should not divide the one Son into two. What Cyril

---

[439] *In Jo.* 2.381.

[440] Ibid.

[441] Ibid.

[442] *In Jo.* 1.112.

[443] *In Jo.* 1.113.

[444] Ibid.

[445] *In Jo.* 2.200. McKinion gave great attention to Cyril's use of the term σκοπός in his writings. He analyzed the intention of the σκοπός of Cyril in his writings.

seems to imply is that when the blind man was asked to see the Son of Man—the wonder-worker—he was asked to see the Son of God; it was through belief that the blind man understood that the Son was presented to him in form of his humiliation. Cyril continued to explain that scriptures loudly proclaimed that the Son and Christ are one. For the Son is one, and only one, both *before* being in conjunction with the flesh and *after* he came with the flesh (εἷς γὰρ καὶ μόνος Υἱὸς, καὶ πρὸ τῆς πρὸς σάρκα συνόδου, καὶ ὅτε συνῆλθε σαρκί).[446] The Son is one before and after the Incarnation. Cyril continued to say that the Word does not show any distinction between what is presented to the bodily eye and what is known through speech (καὶ τὸν τοῖς τοῦ σώματος ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑποπίπτοντα, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς λαλιᾶς γινωσκόμενον).[447] Cyril constantly affirmed that the Son is always one and is one in the Trinity, whether he is in the flesh or not. The state of the Incarnation does not change the oneness of the Son, and to keep the oneness of the Son, the oneness of his nature must be preserved.[448]

McKinion, 23, 30, 33, 227. Kerrigan also discussed the term σκοπός in Kerrigan, *Cyril, Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 87–111.

[446] *In Jo.* 2.200

[447] *In Jo.* 2:201. Liébaert in his work has considered this passage as a crucial and the most representative passage of refusing Christological dualism. Liébaert, *La Doctrine*, 203–4.

[448] Cyril writes in a letter to John of Antioch preserved in Ethiopic and Arabic that "it is not reasonable to isolate each nature, in this way you cease the unity and each is alone in a separate entity…. He who separates Christ, separates the mystery of the name…. This person sets two persons, one is free, the other is captive, one suffers, the other does not suffer. What does it mean to have one name but two operations." B. M. Weischer, *Qerellos IV 1: Homilien und Briefe zum Konzil von Ephesos.* Wiesbaden, 1979. Modern scholarship elaborated on the unity of Christ from the post-Chalcedonian standpoint or focused primarily on post-Nestorian writings. Some scholars used writings of both periods, pre and post Nestorian, without discrimination. Du Manoir presented a summary of Cyril's use of scriptural and patristic references concerning the unity of Christ. He then cited a list of Cyril's Christological terminology. They are as follows: σύνοδος, σύμβασις, συνδρομή, ἀνάληψις and πρόσληψις. Du Manoir wrote that ἐνοίκησις and κατοίκησις are rarely used since they might have Nestorian tendencies. Du Manoir, *Dogme*, 120–126. Working on the Johannine text it was observed that the last two have been used more than "rarely." Therefore, Du Manoir's suggestion is to be taken into consideration that after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy, Cyril decided to minimize his use of these two terms lest they would be misinterpreted. It should be noted that most of the work of Du Manoir is based on post-Nestorian texts. As for

the adverbs used to describe the unity: ἄφραστος, ἀπόῤῥητος, παντελῶς, ἀῤῥήτως, ἀπερινόητος, ἀποῤῥήτως, καὶ ὑπὲρ νοῦν, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἐξαιρέτως, μυστική παραδόξως. Ibid., 125. Liébaert provided his own list. Liébaert's list was primarily focused on the *Thesaurus* and the *Dialogue* and both are pre-Nestorian. Nonetheless, he consulted other post-Nestorian texts as well. Liébaert, *La Doctrine*, 200–3. As for "humanity" Cyril used these terms: σάρξ, σῶμα, τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἀνθρωπότης, ἀνθρώπεια μορφή, τὰ ἡμέτερα, τὸ προσληφθέν, τὰ αὐτῆς (ἀνθρωπότητος), τὸ φερούμενον, ἐν εἴδει τῷ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἐν τοῖς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, γέγονε καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφή. Ibid. 133. Liébaert provided a shorter list of words used by Cyril describing the human condition of Christ. Liébaert , *La Doctrine*, 170. Both Liébaert and McKinion approached the topic by investigating the philosophical background of the Incarnation. McKinion investigated the concepts of place and physical union and the influence of these two themes in Cyril's Christological images. McKinion was of the opinion that Cyril refused unity according to σύνθεσις, μίξις and κρᾶσις. McKinion, 49–79. As for Liébaert, he was of the opinion that there are two possible understandings of becoming man. The Aristotelian understanding -- that of the union between soul and body -- in contrast to the Platonist view of man as a spiritual being engaged in a body. Liébaert was of the opinion that Cyril follows the Platonist prevalent idea and both Didymus the Blind and Apollinarius follow this Platonist worldview. Liébaert, *La Doctrine*, 147–150. Other articles concerned with Cyril's anthropology: H. M. Diepen, "La christologie de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'anthropologie néo-platonicienne," *Euntes Docete* 9 (1956), 20–63. H. M. Diepen, *Aux Origines de l'anthropologie de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1957.) McCoy has another suggestion of how to define the union of Christ and writes that it is "possible to argue that Cyril's *mia physis* formula reflects a heavy reliance upon the analogy of the union of predominance. For though Jesus Christ represents a union "out of two," following the Incarnation there is but the "one nature of the Incarnate Logos-God" and it is questionable whether, in Cyril's understanding, there is a human person following the Incarnation. This is precisely what one would expect if the understanding of the Incarnation were based upon the model of the union of predominance." McCoy also believed that the philosophical framework within which Cyril worked made him "conceive of the Incarnation in a static fashion rather than as an exemplification of the dynamic interaction of God and man." J. D. McCoy, "Philosophical Influences on the Doctrine of the Incarnation in Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria," *Encounter* 38 (1977): 390–1. Liébaert wrote about the unity of Christ that, after the Incarnation, we do not separate except by thought and that the Word is God before the Incarnation and after the Incarnation. Liébaert suggested that Cyril was influenced at this point by Didymus the Blind. Liébaert, *La Doctrine*, 204–210. Liébaert quoted Paschal Letter 11 (420 AD) in which Cyril affirms that the Word vivifies all, that is why the body is considered as his own and one with Him. Ibid., 211. He adds that it is this same logic that prevents us from considering the body of Christ as an instrument. Grillmeier affirmed that the "mia

physis" formula is Apollinarian but concluded that this formula guarantees a one life giving power. Grillmeier clarified that we should not equate the unity of the person with the unity of ἐνέργεια . Grillmeier, 333–6. On the other hand, Samuel wrote that it does not matter if the "mia physis" formula is Apollinarian so long as it is used in an orthodox understanding. He commented that some of the Nicene Creed phrases were unorthodox until agreed to be understood and used in an orthodox way. V. C. Samuel, "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 (1964) 37–53. Fraigneau-Julien summarized his understanding of the unity and wrote that Cyril affirmed the one and unique Christ is composed of two different natures and that they are inseparable after the union. Fraigenau-Julien, "L'efficacité," 616. Norris writes that the Christological models that Cyril uses "make clear the way in which he understands the point of some other figure." This is applied on Christ when Cyril explains that " 'one nature' of man is produced by the knitting together of two dissimilar realities, soul and body, and then apply this analogy to Christ." R. A. Norris, "Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975) 266. McKinion answered this very point in his work when he commented that when Cyril uses an analogy he is not explaining the Incarnation but rather gives an "illustration" of it. Cyril's analogy "serve in the capacity of *illustrating* his formulae, rather than *describing* the event of Incarnation." McKinion, 228. Weinandy shared the same opinion and wrote that the soul/body analogy is used by Cyril to illustrate the oneness of Christ but not to illustrate the type of relationship between them. Weinandy explained that καθ' ὑποστασιν means that the union was with the *person* of the Word with humanity and thus becomes one person united to himself flesh and this establishes an existential type of incarnation. "Actually, conceiving the incarnational act as personal/existential establishes, and so guarantees, that it is truly the one person of the Son who is man and that it is truly as man that the Son exists. It is this insight that the Council of Chalcedon will sanction." Thomas Weinandy, "The Soul/Body Analogy and the Incarnation: Cyril of Alexandria," *Coptic Church Review* 17 (1996), 66. McGuckin writes that "Cyril speaks of this union of deity and humanity as a "Hypostatic Union." The person of the Logos is the sole personal subject of all the conditions of his existence, divine or human." John McGuckin, "A Synopsis of St. Cyril's Christological Doctrine," *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998): 47. Koen presented a general overview of Cyril's ideas about the union. Koen, *The Saving Passion.* Dratsellas describes the unity in these words, "But while He remains God He has added to His eternal Being something new, something that He had not before. He assumed human nature and took the form of a servant and He became, through His Incarnation, Theanthropos. The Logos, while He was Incorporeal, (ἄσαρκος), before the Incarnation, now afterwards is σεσαρκωμένος." C. Dratsellas, "Questions on Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria," *Abba Salama* 6 (1974): 215. Dratsellas was of the opinion that the *mia physis* in Cyril's Christology means the "Physis of the Logos is the subject of the whole sentence." Ibid., 218. Therefore, for Dratsellas the unity is in the Logos and not in the Incarnate Logos. But is not

Cyril wrote much about the Son and is most famous for his Christology, which explains why most modern scholarship has given attention to his understanding of the Son and his nature. At the same time, the main focus of modern scholarship is on the post-Nestorian literary works of Cyril. It is for good reason that scholarship focused on his later writings for they are more engaged in Christological issues and instrumental in settling the Christological controversy. Modern scholarship is so specialized in its concern that it has focused on Christology without looking at the bigger Trinitarian picture, within which Cyril is working. For example, modern scholarship has concentrated on the following topics in Cyril's Christology: the unity of the divinity and the humanity, the presence of a soul in Christ, the suffering of Christ, and the issue of ignorance. In addition, these studies are constantly using vocabulary within the framework of post-Chalcedonian theology and focusing on the unity from the Chalcedonian point of view. The previous quotes demonstrate Cyril's constant emphasis on the unity of the Son with the persons of the Trinity while each preserves their distinctiveness. Cyril gave great attention to the work (ἐνέργεια) of the Son in relationship to the Father and the assumed flesh. The unity of the ἐνέργεια with the body that is his own preserves the unity with the Father and consequently the Trinity. The Incarnate Word redeems humanity by conquering death in his own flesh, and through his own flesh, grants humanity victory over death and incorruption; his life-giving body grants humanity life and humanity thus receives the "newness of life," that is, to be deified and saved. The unity of the body or humanity to the divinity is preserved at all times even after the ascension for we believe in one Christ before the Incarnation and after the Incarnation. The state of the Incarnation does not change the oneness of the Son and to keep the oneness of the Son the oneness of his nature has to be preserved. The Incarnate Word is life-giving, and the body of the Incarnate Word—the Eucharist—is also life-giving. The mystery of the Incarnation sheds light on the mystery of the Eucharist. Through his meticulous exposition of

---

the Logos already one before the Incarnation why does he have to be assigned the term "mia physis?" McKinion has a good summary of what scholars have said about the unity in his chapter "Various Interpretation of Cyril's Christology." Mckinion, 181–191. A most excellent article that sums Cyril's opinion about unity is in R. M. Siddals, "Oness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica* 18 (1985): 207–211. The varied interpretation of the oneness and unity of the person of Christ among scholars sometimes seems irreconcilable. However, a quick exposition of varied interpretation is important for further research and discussions.

the Johannine text, following the main themes of the Incarnation, death, and resurrection, Cyril explained the nature of Christ, the relationship of the Son to the Trinity, and salvation.

The Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, is of equal divinity to the Father and the Son. Once Cyril was content that he defended the divinity of the Spirit, he explained the difference between the Spirit of the Son and the Spirit of the prophets and that it is the Spirit of the Son that personally dwells in the saints. Cyril also pointed to the work of the Spirit that enables us to say, *Abba Father*, that is, has granted us sonship. The work of the Spirit is also manifest in the creation and in the Spirit's participation in the nature of man. Because of this participation, the Spirit has a role in the newness of life granted by the Son. In conformity with the Cyrillian Trinitarian formula, Cyril asserted that the Spirit is sent through the Son. And with this he answers the question of when and where the disciples received the Spirit. It is these topics that we discuss in this section.

When Cyril commented on Jn 1:1, *and the Word was with God*, one would expect him to limit his comments to the relationship between the Word and the Father. After Cyril asserted that the Father is a person in his own, and so is the Son, he quickly added that the Holy Spirit shares the same characteristic as the Father and the Son and should be counted as God (συνθεολογουμένου).[449] He later asserted, in commenting on the same verse, that we are justified (δικαιούμεθα) in belief in the Father and Son and the Holy Spirit.[450] Therefore, the presence of the Holy Spirit is crucial in Cyril's expositions of the basic texts that deal directly with the Incarnation.

The Spirit is equally divine; how else can one say that the person who receives the Spirit is a partaker (μέτοχος) of God or how could Peter say that we are *participants [κοινωνοὶ] of the divine nature* (2 Pet 1:4) if the Spirit is not God. If it is a created and not a divine spirit that dwells within us, how could we say that we are the temples of God? Those who willingly accept the Spirit to dwell in their hearts, intellectually perceive the divine (νοητῶς θεωροῦσι).[451] This great honor and privilege is envied by all. Therefore, the indwelling of the Spirit is the beginning of the newness of life that is granted to those accepting the Incarnate Son. The Spirit dwells in them. The Spirit gives them the privilege to envisage God and gives them the

[449] *In Jo.* 1.25.
[450] *In Jo.* 1.27.
[451] *In Jo.* 2.469.

right of sonship to cry out, *Abba, Father*, for *because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!"* (Gal 4:6). The Incarnate Word communicates the Spirit of divine sonship to human nature.[452]

As God gives the Spirit without measure, so does the Son for, *He whom God has sent speaks the words of God, for he gives the Spirit without measure* (Jn 3:34). The Spirit of the Son is very different from the Spirit bestowed on prophets. Athansius explained that the "Word became flesh" means that He did not come into man as he used to come into the saints.[453] The prophets and saints received the Spirit with measure and they were unable to bestow it on one another. It is only the Son who gives the Spirit from his own fullness (ὡς ἐξ ἰδίου πληρώματος) and he gives it by virtue of essence in himself (οὐσιωδῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ) not as a participant.[454] For the Son, the bestower of the Spirit is superior to the prophets and saints. When the apostolic hands (χειρῶν ἀποστολικῶν) give the Spirit to someone, they are not true givers of the Spirit but rather summoners of the Spirit (πνευματοκλήτορας). Cyril is very clear in his thoughts and precise in his expressions. He coined the word πνευματοκλήτορας to convey the meaning.[455] Cyril then supported his argument with the example of Moses. Moses could not keep the Spirit that was upon him, but it was in God's power alone to bestow it on others and, therefore, God took the Spirit that was upon him and gave it to the seventy elders.[456] Neither the prophets, nor the saints, nor the apostles had the power of bestowing the Spirit, but it is in God's power alone. When the Spirit dwells in someone, like Paul, they are called God bearers (θεοφόρος).[457] But, since the Spirit is not of their essence, they cannot bestow it on others, as we have said above, they are just summoners of the Spirit.[458]

---

[452] *In Jo.* 1.470. De Halleux, "Cyrille, Théodoret et le 'Filioque,'" 625.

[453] St. Athanasius *Contra Arianus*, 3.30.

[454] *In Jo.* 1.253.

[455] Ibid., πνευματοκλήτορας is one of the words coined by Cyril and used in this commentary and is found no where else and used by no one else. Lampe, 1106.

[456] Ibid. Num 11:17.

[457] *In Jo.* 2.442.

[458] Burghardt commented that Cyril made a distinction in the intervention of the Spirit in the Old Testament from that of the New Testament and quotes Cyril, "The Spirit was in the prophets for the requirements of prophecy, but now He dwells in the faithful through Christ—and first of all in Him, when He became man." (*In Jo.* 1.697) Burghardt commented that the difference is that in the first

Cyril clearly states that the Spirit is through the Son and in the Son (τὸ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ), and it is this Spirit that personally dwells in the saints.[459] The Spirit and the Son are one even though we conceive each of them as having an independent existence. Again, it is not that the Spirit of the Son is the Spirit of the saints, but rather it is the Spirit of the Son that dwells in the saints.[460] The Spirit of the Son is the source of sanctification of the saints. Cyril here emphasized the sanctifying power of the Spirit of the Son. Elsewhere he wrote that sanctification is the union with God. He wrote that the communion (κοινωνίας) and union (ἑνώσεως) with God cannot be achieved without the participation of the Holy Spirit. Union with God is achieved by regaining our perfect image. The pure image of the Father is the Son, and the natural likeness of the Son is his Spirit (εἰκὼν μὲν γὰρ ἀκραιφνὴς τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, ὁμοίωσις δὲ φυσικὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ).[461] Again, he introduced his argument by narrating the perfect image of man at the time of creation and how, through disobedience, death and corruption overcame human nature. Here, Cyril involved the whole Trinity in the process of sanctification. It is not the Holy Spirit alone that renders sanctification. It is the Spirit of the Son, the Son is the image of the Father, and the utter goal is reaching union with God. This holistic view of the role of the Trinity in the process of sanctification is a constant theme in Cyril.

Cyril emphasized the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The means to defend the divine essence of the Holy Spirit is to say that it is *in* the Son (ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ), not from without as in the case of saints or prophets, but by virtue of essence and by nature (ἀλλ᾽ οὐσιωδῶς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν).[462] The proof that

---

case it is "illumination" (ἔλλαμψις) and in the second it is "complete and perfect indwelling" (κατοίκησις). Burghardt, *Image of God in Man*, 115.

[459] *In Jo.* 2.639.

[460] Keating believed that Cyril's idea of divine indwelling has been misrepresented in modern scholarship. He argued that modern scholarship has tended to focus on Cyril's account of redemption from the standpoint of the Eucharist and he argued that this is a distortion of Cyril's theology. Modern scholarship has not given much attention to the "mode of divine indwelling through the Holy Spirit." Keating opposed Gebremedhin approach (p28) and argued that divine indwelling of the Spirit is "characteristic of Cyril's own thought, both exegetically and dogmatically." Daniel Keating, "The Twofold Manner of Divine Indwelling in Cyril of Alexandria: Redressing an Imbalance," *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001) 546–7.

[461] *In Jo.* 2.731

[462] *In Jo.* 1.174. Cyril insisted that the Spirit is *in* the Son. This is very much related to the famous formula that "All things are from the Father, through the

the Son was holy before the Incarnation and did not need an external sanctification from the Holy Spirit, is pronounced by Isaiah, who narrates to us that he was glorified by the Seraphim by repeating *Holy* three times (Is 6:3).[463] Therefore, sanctification is in the Son, before and after the Incarnation, and he does not receive the Spirit from without as saints and prophets do.

If the Son has the Spirit in himself, how then do we understand, *I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it remained on him* (Jn 1:32). Cyril explained the descent of the Spirit beginning from the creation story.[464] The first man, being of the earth, had the choice between good and evil, he became master of his choice. Having chosen evil, he suffered death and corruption, sin reigned (βεβασίλευκεν ἡ ἁμαρτία), and the nature of man was shown stripped of the Holy Spirit's indwelling (γυμνή τε οὕτω λοιπὸν τοῦ ἐνοικισθέντος Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις ἀνεδείκνυτο).[465] Thus, the Holy Spirit departed from man, and God promised to send from heaven the second Adam. He sent his own Son, who was without sin and without change and through his obedience we might escape the wrath of the first disobedience. When the Son became Incarnate he received the Spirit, not taking it for himself as his own, for he is the abundant giver (χορηγός) of the Spirit, but he received the Spirit to preserve it in his nature, as man, to implant (ῥιζώσῃ) grace in us. For this reason, he received the Spirit, to renew (ἀνανεοῖ) in us the ancient good.[466] He also receives the Spirit on our behalf, so that he may sanctify our whole nature.[467] Therefore,

---

Son, in the Spirit." But Du Manoir was of the opinion that if the Spirit is not a creature and it is by which the Father operates, then Du Manoir noted it is very logical to conclude that if the Holy Spirit depends on the Son for Divine operations then the Holy Spirit also depends on its origin on the Son. Du Manoir, *Dogme*, 227. Du Manoir based his argument on his personal logic not on Cyril's works. Du Manoir devoted p224–230 to prove the Filioque from Cyril's writings.

[463] *In Jo.* 1.137.

[464] St. Athanasius in *de incarnatione* argued that the story of creation is of paramount importance to understand the Incarnation and salvation, *de incarnatione* 4 and 5. Again, the influence of Athanasius was evident in Cyril's thoughts and how it affected his arguments.

[465] *In Jo.* 1.184.

[466] *In Jo.* 1.184,5.

[467] *In Jo.* 1.185. Liébaert summarized Cyril's answer concerning the issue of sanctification into three main points. First, Cyril proved that the Son is of equal divinity to the Father and thus does not need the sanctification of the Spirit. Second, he explained the text from the standpoint of the Incarnation. Third, he demonstrated the unity of the Trinity and demonstrated the essential unity between

the Son receives the Spirit not to be sanctified, but to sanctify our nature. Not as saints and prophets receive the Spirit, he receives it on our behalf to give it back to us in abundance. For the Spirit, is by virtue of essence, (οὐσιωδῶς) in his nature and is not there by participation (μεθεκτὸν).[468]

The Son did not need the Spirit to descend from heaven and remain on him for the angel said to Mary that the, *child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God* (Lk 1:35). There is a contrast to John the Baptist who, *will be filled with the Holy Spirit* (Lk 1:15), for the Holy Spirit was in him as a gift and not by virtue of essence (δοτόν γὰρ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ οὐκ οὐσιῶδες τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα).[469] Again Cyril compared the presence of the Holy Spirit in Christ and other figures recorded in scripture to enforce his argument that the Holy Spirit is by nature οὐσιῶδες of the Son while it is granted to prophets and saints as a gift.

The unity and the divinity of both the Son and the Spirit are essential for the Trinitarian thought of Cyril. He argued that in the verse, *I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, to be with you forever. This is the Spirit of truth* (Jn 14:15,6); the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of truth. In addition, Christ said that he is "the Truth" (Jn 14:6). Therefore, the Son has oneness (ἑνότητα) with the Spirit.[470] Cyril proved his theological argument by a series of verses thematically connected until he reaches his theological aim.

---

the Son and the Holy Spirit. Liébaert, *La doctrine*, p. 109–113. Mahe listed all means of sanctification that Cyril mentioned throughout his literary work. Mahe wrote that Cyril described sanctification as purification, as a transformation of the soul, a change from corruption to incorruption, a change from vice to virtue and from servitude to freedom, a reconciliation between God and man, an elevation to a superior nature than our own, it is a new birth, a new creation, a restoration of our nature, and a return to our original state of creation. All these descriptions of sanctification can really be summed up in that it is a "newness of life" and a "new creation." J. Mahe, "La sanctification d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire écclésiastique* 10 (1909) 32. Wilken believed that Cyril's interpretation of the baptism of Christ is one of the most "complete and thoroughgoing interoperations of the baptism of Jesus in the patristic Church…. Exegesis and theology blend in his treatment of the problem." Wilken writes that Cyril in his interpretation "made it possible for the Spirit to return again to mankind. He does this through the resurrection from the dead, and by his resurrection he opens up a new way for mankind which had not been known before. In him there is a new creation." Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 140.

[468] Ibid.

[469] *In Jo.* 1.186.

[470] *In Jo.* 1.188.

Such method of theological argumentation and biblical interpretation became a trait in Alexandrian exegesis beginning with Origen.

Cyril took the opportunity to elaborate on the power of regeneration of the Spirit when Nicodemus could not understand what it is to be, *born from above* and *being born of water and Spirit* (Jn 4:3,5). Cyril explained that the regeneration through the Spirit (τὴν διὰ Πνεύματος ἀναγέννησιν) is done through partaking of the divine nature (τῆς θείας φύσεως γινόμεθα κοινωνοὶ) (2 Pet 1:4). We are restored to the divine sonship and brought forth to the newness of life (καινότητα ζωῆς) through him and in him (δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ) to become and be transformed completely to the archetype.[471] Again the power of the Son to restore is joined with the power of the Spirit to achieve this newness of life. For "in him" refers to the Holy Spirit and "through him" refers to the Son, following the Cyrillian Trinitarian formula. Once again, the idea of transformation through the newness of life recalls the Athanasian opinion that "God became man so that we might become gods." Cyril further explained that the process of newness and restoration to the original image of the archetypal beauty (ἀρχέτυπον ... κάλλος) is carried on in a twofold manner. Since man is composite and not of single nature (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σύνθετόν τι καὶ οὐχ ἁπλοῦν κατὰ φύσιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος), that is, of body and soul, therefore man will require a twofold healing (διπλῆς ... θεραπείας).[472] This is the reason that the verse, *without being born of water and Spirit*, has a twofold aspect. For the spirit of man is sanctified by the Spirit and the body of man is sanctified by water. Therefore, through the working of the Spirit, the sensible water is transformed and gains the power to sanctify. Cyril seemed to hint later that in many cases when water is mentioned it is often a way of naming the Holy Spirit.[473]

Cyril attributed to the Spirit the same property of life giving as he does to the Son. In Jn 6:63 it is written, *it is the Spirit that gives life*. So how do we understand this verse? Cyril explained that the flesh has no power of its own to be life-giving. Through the mystery of the Incarnation we learn that the life-giving Word who dwells in the flesh has the power to impart life (δύναται ζωοποιεῖν).[474] For neither Peter nor Paul could have this life

---

[471] *In Jo.* 1.218,9.

[472] *In Jo.* 1.219

[473] *In Jo.* 1.268,9. Cyril quoted Is 43:20,21; Jer 31:12 LXX and Is 44:4 in which water has a power of renewing of life, though in these quotes the comparison usually begins with the effect of water on animals and plants where it is considered a metaphor to human life.

[474] *In Jo.* 1.551.

giving power, it is only through Christ, *for in him the whole fullness of the deity dwells bodily* (Col 2:9). Still, *God is spirit* (Jn 4:24), and Paul says that, *the Lord is the Spirit* (2 Cor 3:17). Thus, the Son who calls himself from his own Spirit (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου πνεύματος ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει), has this life giving power. In the end, Cyril affirmed that this does not mean a subordination (ὑφεστάναι) of the Spirit but that we have to understand that the Spirit has its own proper existence for his Spirit is no other than himself (οὐ γὰρ ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ).[475]

Cyril realized that calling the Son Spirit might be confusing and in need of more proof, and set out to list verses that assert that the Son has often been called or referred to as Spirit. Cyril made the verses prove his point. In 1 Jn 5:6, it is written, *the Spirit is the one that testifies, for the Spirit is the truth*. We know that Christ said that, *I am the truth* (Jn 14:6), therefore, both the Spirit and Christ are one and both are "the Truth." Cyril's argument became more clear when he quoted Romans 8:8–10, *and those who are in the flesh cannot please God. But you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. But if Christ is in you, though the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is life because of righteousness.*[476] For Cyril, this was enough evidence to prove that the Spirit of God dwells in us for he himself said that Christ is in us (αὐτὸν εἴρηκεν ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν). For his Spirit is indivisible of the Son (ἀδιαίρετον γὰρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ).[477] Even though we know that the Son is inseparable from the Spirit, we have to also acknowledge that each is existing in their own entity (νοοῖτο ὑπάρχειν ἰδιοσυστάτως).[478] Thus, the name "Spirit" or "Son" are very often undifferentiated (ἀδιαφορεῖ).[479] Therefore, because of the interchange of names between the Son and the Spirit, Cyril was able to claim that both have the life giving power since both are one and the same but each exists separately. This has to be understood within the oneness and unity of the Trinity in order to assemble the oneness of activity that each person of the Trinity has without dividing the Godhead.

Knowing the distinction between the Son and the Spirit, and knowing that the Son is Son and not Spirit, and the Spirit is Spirit and not Son, Jn 14:18 says that the Paraclete is sent forth, after which the Son promises that

---

[475] *In Jo.* 1.552.

[476] Cyril used the same argument about the Son and the Spirit and used the same verses in *In Jo.* 2.471.

[477] *In Jo.* 1.554.

[478] Ibid.

[479] Ibid.

he will come himself. Even if it seems that they are identical to each other, each is distinct. With this emphasis on distinctiveness, Cyril warned his readers not to be confused when seeing that the proper Spirit is of the Father and is conceived to be of him (ἐπείπερ ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἴδιον Πνεῦμα καὶ αὐτοῦ νοεῖται). We could even call the Spirit his mind (νοῦς αὐτοῦ).[480] It is not exceedingly difficult to claim that, because Paul says that *we have the mind of Christ* (1 Cor 2:16). We have the mind of Christ, we have Christ, we have God, and we have the Spirit of God.

Cyril was concerned with the relationship of the Son to the Holy Spirit, for preserving the divinity of the Holy Spirit affects that of the Son and vice versa. Cyril wrote that when Christ speaks about the Paraclete, he is speaking about the Spirit of Truth, that is, his own Spirit that comes from the Father. The Spirit is naturally of the Son and is in him (ἐν αὐτῷ) and is sent forth through him (δι᾽ αὐτοῦ προϊὸν).[481] Cyril adhered to the formula that relegates to the Son all action and operation (ἐνέργεια) to be done "through" him. It will follow then that the sending of the Spirit is "through" the Son. Nevertheless, we cannot draw any distinction (διωρισμένα) of essence between the Son and the Spirit.[482] We should recognize that when the Son sends forth the Spirit, this does not mean that the Spirit is different in essence or less than the Son. As previously mentioned, the Spirit has to be of God to be able to provide sanctification. In addition, the Paraclete is the Holy Spirit, and belongs to the Son and is not from outside (ἔξωθεν) nor is it acquired (ἐπίκτητον).[483] As Cyril stressed the distinctiveness of each person of the Trinity he reminded his readers of the unity of the Trinity and described the unity as being bound up tightly (ἀνασφίγγεται) in one divinity (ἕνα θεότητος), showing the unity of substance (τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ἑνότητα).[484] The unity of the Trinity preserves the divinity of each person of the Trinity and at the same time shows the

---

[480] *In Jo.* 2.471.

[481] *In Jo.* 2.607.

[482] Ibid.

[483] *In Jo.* 2.609. McKinion writes that Cyril "maintains that Christ performs divine works because he is God, and therefore, the Spirit of God is his own Spirit. Consequently, the power to perform miracles is his own power. He is not an instrument for accomplishing them, instead, he does these works himself, in his own power. He reiterates this claim by stating, against Nestorius, that the Spirit of God is within Christ and from him, and is not foreign to him. (*Adversus Nestorium ACO* 1.1.6.77.)" McKinion, 146–7. The notion that the Spirit is not foreign to Christ prevailed in Cyril's writings even after the Nestorian controversy.

[484] Ibid.

distinctiveness of activity of each person within. The correct balance between the unity and distinctiveness is a major theological theme in Cyril's writings.

The theme that the Spirit is sent "through" the Son is again mentioned when Cyril explained Jn 17:18,19; *As you have sent me into the world, so I have sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, so that they also may be sanctified in truth*. Cyril explained that when scripture mentions that the disciples were to be "sanctified in truth" it means sanctified in his Spirit, for the Spirit is truth (τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια), and also the Spirit is of the truth (ἐπεὶ καὶ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστὶν) that is of the Son.[485] He sent the apostles and prepares them for sanctification by the Father. He causes the Holy Spirit to dwell in them through the Son (ἐνοικίζοντος αὐτοῖς δηλονότι δι᾽ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ᾽Αγιον).[486] It is this Spirit that guided them through their evangelization to the world. This Spirit gave them power and enlightenment and inspiration. After the resurrection, Christ clearly promised the Holy Spirit to his disciples. It is the Spirit of God the Father proper to God the Father (ἴδιον γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμὰ ἐστιν) and is of his essence.[487] It is the Father who pours out the Spirit through the Son himself (χεόμενον μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ).[488] It is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, also, since both are of the same substance. When the Son asked the Father for sanctification he was asking for the restoration and renewal of creation. This sanctification is achieved through and in the Spirit (τὸν ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγιασμὸν).[489] Again, Cyril resorted to the story of creation, the story that narrates how at creation God breathed into the nostrils of man the breath of life (Gen 2:7) which, for Cyril, signified the sanctification by the Spirit.[490] Thus, after the resurrection, when Christ

---

[485] *In Jo.* 2.717.

[486] Ibid.

[487] *In Jo.* 2.718.

[488] Ibid.

[489] Ibid. Burghardt wrote that Cyril, when he speaks about sanctification constantly oscillates between the Spirit and the Son. "The justification of this fluctuation stems from the fact that, for Cyril, our participation in God, as well as our resemblance to God, has reference to the three Persons; we share in the divine nature." Burghardt, *The Image of God*, 70.

[490] Keating argues that Cyril's use of the Gen. 2:7 verse not to refer "to the inbreathing of the human soul, but to the original gift of the Holy Spirit, is a distinctive feature of his thought and central to his narrative of redemption." Keating even calls Cyril "the theologian of the divine indwelling." D. Keating,

bestowed the Holy Spirit on the disciples, it was the restoration of sanctification through the Spirit, and a communion with the divine nature (τὸν διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγιασμὸν, καὶ τὴν τῆς θείας φύσεως κοινωνίαν).[491] Humanity therefore achieves the newness of life.

Cyril attempted to make sense of Jn 7:39, *for yet there was no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified.* If there was no Spirit, then how did the prophets prophesy and how could the stories of Elisha together with other prophets of the Old Testament be understood? Once again, Cyril began his explanation with the story of creation. He wrote that man was created in incorruption because the Spirit of God abided in man. After the transgression, the Spirit abandoned man. At the time of the Incarnation, the Father began to give the Spirit again, and Christ—being the first fruit—initially received it as the beginning of the renewed nature. The beginning of this renewal through the Spirit began with the descent of the Spirit on Christ during his baptism. Nonetheless, the Spirit is "his own," so how did Christ receive the Spirit in baptism. He received it as man, so that we in him may receive the Spirit (ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα κερδάνωμεν).[492]

Cyril posed the question of when and where the disciples received the Holy Spirit? Was it at the time when Christ appeared in the house after the resurrection and told his disciples, *Receive the Holy Spirit* (Jn 20:22) or was it at the time of Pentecost (Acts 2:2–4). Some might suppose that the disciples received a double dose of grace (διττὴν ... τὴν χάριν) or that we simply do not know the event at which the pouring of the Spirit took place.[493] Yet Christ is Truth and he cannot say anything but the truth and he has said, *Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you* (Jn 16:7). Cyril explained that it is significant that Christ is with the Father when the Spirit is given to the disciples for it shows that the Son is giving the Spirit with the Father (καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ Συνδοτῆρα φαίνεσθαι τὸν Υἱὸν).[494] It shows that the Father is giving the Spirit through the Son and in cooperation with him. For it is significant that those who believe in the Son know that he is the power of the Father and that he is the creator of the world, for the Word created man and endowed him with the spirit of life

---

"Divine Indwelling," 547–8. Keating's article referred to other articles that deal with the opinion of the fathers concerning Gen. 2:7 and includes more remarks on Cyril's interpretation of Gen. 2:7.

[491] *In Jo.* 2.720

[492] *In Jo.* 1.693.

[493] *In Jo.* 3.133

[494] *In Jo.* 3.134.

(Gen 2:7).[495] With disobedience man fell into corruption and came under the power of death, but the Father restored him to newness of life through the Son (καὶ εἰς καινότητα ζωῆς ἀνεκόμισε δι᾽ Υἱοῦ) as at the beginning.[496] Restoration took place through the Son. By the death of His holy flesh He conquered death (τῷ θανάτῳ τῆς ἁγίας σαρκὸς νεκρώσας τὸν θάνατον) and consequently incorruption. He died and rose from the dead and secured victory for humanity. He had to reveal to humanity that it was He who created us at the beginning and it was He who sealed us with the Holy Spirit (καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ δὲ ἡμᾶς κατασφραγίσαντα Πνεύματι).[497] He, as our Savior, is the one who can grant this Spirit to us since He is the one who granted it to us in the beginning. Thus, He granted the Spirit through a visible form (ἐναργοῦς) to his disciples so as to announce the renewed nature (τῆς ἀνακαινιζομένης φύσεως) of humanity. The Spirit impresses its image on the person who accepts it and in this way the person is transformed into the likeness of the maker (κατ᾽ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος).[498] Christ cannot make an impress on the soul of a person unless this person willingly partakes of the Spirit and follows the Gospel laws. This is the work of the Spirit in man.

Christ constantly proclaimed future events so that when they happen we believe that He spoke the truth. He raised Lazarus, the widow's son, and the daughter of Jairus so that when He speaks about His own resurrection we believe that what He said is truth and that He fulfills His promises. He thus proclaimed that He would send the Spirit, and He promised that He would fulfill this promise after He is with the Father. He granted His disciples the Spirit at this special event as a first fruit of His promise as He had done for other promises.[499] Based on this argument Cyril concluded that the disciples did receive the Holy Spirit at the time when Christ pronounced, *Receive the Holy Spirit*, for Christ is The Truth and cannot lie. As for Pentecost day, God more visibly (ἐμφανεστέραν) granted the gift of the Spirit.[500] The first time it was given in their hearts, but now in this visible form it was granted with tongues of fire as the time when they were first endowed with the gift of languages. They had already been sanctified by the first gift of the Spirit but now they were able to speak in tongues to

[495] The Athanasian argument of explaining any part of salvation by beginning with the story of creation.

[496] *In Jo.* 3.135.

[497] Ibid.

[498] Ibid.

[499] *In Jo.* 3.137.

[500] Ibid.

proclaim the manifestation of their grace in a more public manner. In this way, when they were heard speaking tongues as a result of the presence of the Spirit, those who heard them believed that they had been sanctified with the Spirit on previous occasion. Therefore, Cyril proposed two occasions for the descent of the Holy Spirit. The first was for sanctification which is promised for our renewal and salvation and as a precursor of the promise of the Spirit. The second was in a more visible way to prove the first event and make it a tangible proof for people to believe the inward work of the Spirit for the newness of life.

The confirmation of the idea that the disciples did not receive the Spirit before Christ ascended to the Father is in Jn 20:17 when Christ said to Mary Magdalene, *Do not hold on to me, because I have not yet ascended to the Father*. Cyril explained that the nature of God cannot be defiled (μολυσμὸν) by a touch.[501] The reason that Christ gives to Mary for not allowing her to hold on to him is that he has, *not yet ascended to the Father*. Cyril elucidated his point by saying that before the crucifixion Christ mingled with the just and unjust and ate with the sinners and let everyone touch him. For he is the physician who came to heal the sick (Lk 5:31). He did not stop the woman who came to him in the house of a Pharisee and bathed his feet with her tears and dried them with her hair (Lk 7:38). Nor did he reprimand the woman who had suffered from hemorrhages for twelve years and *touched the fringe of his clothes* (Lk 8:43,44) but rather healed her and comforted her. However, after the resurrection he said, *Do not hold on to me, because I have not yet ascended to the Father*, based on what he had already told them earlier in Jn 16:7, *I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go I will send him to you*. After Christ left Mary Magdalene, the Johannine Gospel narrates that Christ appeared in the house and said, "*Peace be with you. As the Father has sent me, so I send you." When he had said this, he breathed on them and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit."* (Jn 20:21,22). The disciples received the Spirit after he announced that the Father sent him.[502] He ascended to the Father and thus they received the Spirit from the Father through the Son.[503]

---

[501] *In Jo.* 3.117.

[502] *In Jo.* 3: 117–119.

[503] *In Jo.* 3.134. Mahé wrote that Christ has not communicated the Holy Spirit to our nature before the resurrection. Only after the resurrection did he become of the principal of our regeneration. Mahé added that this is the reason why in the Old Testament and the Law the prophets did not have the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit guided them but did not dwell in them. J. Mahé, "La sanctification d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire écclésiastique* 10 (1909) 35–6. Wilken also commented

Cyril confirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. He added that the Holy Spirit is also the Spirit of the Son but very different from the Spirit bestowed on the prophets or Apostles. It is only the Son who can bestow the Spirit. The Apostles are only bearers and summoners of the Holy Spirit. The notion that the Apostles are summoners of the Spirit will later shape the role and power of the priesthood in the Alexandrian Church. The Son received the Holy Spirit not to be sanctified but to sanctify human nature. Sanctification, regeneration, sonship, and newness of life are achieved through the Son in the Spirit. A quick reading of Cyril might give the impression that the role of the Son is not different from that of the Spirit since both are, for example, life-giving, or the Son and the Spirit are not distinct since the Son is the Truth (Jn 14:6) and the Spirit is the Truth (1 Jn 5:6). Exchange of titles should not lead to confusion. Each person exists separately and is distinct. This is the mystery of the oneness of the Trinity and the oneness of the activity of each person of the Trinity. This is explained in the sending of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit was sent from the Father through the Son. It is the Spirit of sanctification, enlightenment, inspiration, and evangelization. Cyril's Trinitarian formula everything is from the Father though the Son in the Holy Spirit guards the understanding of the Trinity, each person of the Trinity, activity of each person within the Trinity, and the unity and distinctiveness of the Trinity.

Conclusion

The text under study is an exegetical text primarily concerned with doctrinal issues with a particular focus on the Arian heresy. There was no attempt on Cyril's side to make it a homogeneous dogmatic treatise; rather, he followed the biblical text and commented extensively on it. Because that is the kind of text it is, we cannot suggest that the conclusions, about the Trinity and each person of it, are a final and definitive representation of Cyril's

---

that only after the resurrection did the Spirit descend and renewal took place. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 137. Though both Mahé and Wilken are right to say that the Spirit was not received before the resurrection, it is more precise to say that the Spirit was communicated after Christ ascended to the Father, that is, the resurrection in combination with the ascension to the Father is the beginning of the communication of the Spirit to humanity. De Margerie commented very briefly on the moment of the descent of the Holy Spirit by saying that Cyril was the only one who was able to reconcile the two texts of Jn 20:22 and Acts 2:43. Bernard De Margerie, "Saint Cyril of Alexandria Develops a Christocentric Exegesis," in *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis*, trans. Leonard Maluf, vol. 1 (Petersham, Mass.: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993): 250.

Trinitarian theology. Nevertheless, this is an attempt to gather, as much as possible, the constantly recurring images, because Cyril is very repetitive in his style of writing about each person of the Trinity. The commentary gives an extraordinary amount of details about various issues, but the focus is on the holistic image of the Trinity as presented in Cyril's Johannine Commentary. The importance of the Trinity is well pronounced in this commentary. The Trinity constitutes the main framework within which Cyril forms his theology. Since most scholarship focused on specific topics in Cyril's work, it was time to present a framework that would put all of Cyril's theological ideas into perspective.

Cyril is an Alexandrian naturally influenced by the theology of the Alexandrian church. St. Athanasius was the major figure that made the greatest impression on his ideas. As demonstrated throughout the chapter, Athanasius' influence was not only in his understanding of the aim of the Incarnation and main theological and Christological concepts, the influence was also in the details. Liébaert definitively proved in his study, with extensive charts, the influence of Athanasius on Cyril's *Thesaurus* and the *Dialogues on the Trinity*. This chapter revealed the parallelism between Athanasius' idea of deification of humanity through the Incarnation and Cyril's idea of the Incarnate Word bestowing the newness of life to those who believe in him. The Word grants a new creation through the vivifying power of the body that he took as his own. The newness of life is given from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.

When Cyril spoke about God, he was speaking about the Trinity. For him, the Christian God is a Trinitarian God. Our worship must demonstrate our faith and thus we must give equal glory and equal worship to each person of the Trinity. A major theme in Cyril's theology is the insistence on the distinctiveness of each person of the Trinity, while at the same time preserving their unity. Due to the unity of the Trinity, the unity of the Son is paramount. For, if we sever the nature of the Incarnate Word, then we separate the flesh from the Word and speak of two sons. Then we do not have a Trinity but a belief in a God in four persons, a Quaternity.

Cyril confirms the importance of the Trinitarian thought in our minds by proving that it is Biblical. Our initiation to the Christian faith involves our baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If the existence of the Trinity does not contribute to our mental understanding and contribute directly to our vision of the Godhead, then there is no need to call the Father "Father," the Son "Son," and the Holy Spirit "Holy Spirit." Each person of the Trinity sheds light on the nature of the Trinity and leads to an understanding of each person within it. The Trinity works in

unity, for everything is from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The work of creation was done in unity among the Trinity. If the Son's work is to redeem humanity through the Incarnation, for he is the power of God, the redemptive work was done in unity. It was the Father who "sent," the Son who was sent, and the Holy Spirit contributed in the making of the body of the Incarnate Word. All this is to be understood within the oneness of the Trinity while not mixing the difference and distinctiveness of each person. While each reserves their own name, we still refer to one Godhead.

The Father is the begetter of the Son. Divine fatherhood is bestowed on humanity when we address him as "Our Father who art in heaven." We know the Father through the Son and it is through the Son and his witness that the Father is revealed.

The Son is equal to the Father. That the Father works through the Son does not make the Son less than the Father for the Son has all power and authority as the Father. The divine powers of the Son did not change before being in the flesh or after assuming the flesh. The Son reveals the Father to us. Revealing the attributes of the Son asserts his divinity and therefore reveals the divine attributes and at the same time the attributes of the Father and the whole Trinity. The Son is light, healer, forgiver of sins, shepherd, messenger of the covenant, sacrifice and law. Though we know the Father through the Son, at the same time, we have to recognize that each is distinct from the other. The Son is the Father's power and all work is done through the Son. The main work of the Son is the Incarnation. The aim of the Incarnation is to condemn sin in the flesh, to overcome death, and, through the regeneration of the Spirit to become children of God. The Son bestows life to us. The Son is Life, and when he is united with the flesh and takes it as his own, he bestows life to those who believe in him. The Son did not receive the Spirit for himself, but rather in himself for us for all good things will be transmitted from him to us. He is unchangeable and thus can instill in humanity his unchangeableness and reverse the changeableness of the Adam. Renewal of humanity was achieved when the Son took human nature as his own and established the newness of life within humanity. The unity of the Word with his body is not separated at any time after the Incarnation. Even after the ascension we cannot divide Christ into two. This unity is not only preserved during the ascension, but still persists even when the Son of Man descends from heaven. The indivisibility of humanity from the divinity of the Incarnate Word persists at all times and under all conditions. The indivisibility and oneness of the Son must be preserved not only within his own nature but also within the Trinity.

The Holy Spirit is God. The Holy Spirit is divine because those who partake of the Holy Spirit are partakers of God. Those who willingly accept the Spirit to dwell in their hearts also intellectually perceive the divine. The indwelling of the Spirit is the beginning of the newness of life. The Spirit gives us the ability to perceive God and to receive the divine sonship. God gives the Spirit without measure. The Spirit of the Son is different from the Spirit bestowed on prophets and saints. The Spirit is through the Son and in the Son. It is not the Spirit of the Son that dwells in the saints. Therefore, when we say the Spirit is in the Son, we actually mean that it is divine as the Son because it is not from without. It is the Spirit of the Son and is in the Son. John Damascene wrote, "we do not say that the Spirit *is from* (ἐκ) the Son, but we call Him the Spirit *of* the Son."[504] The Spirit of the Son sanctifies us and the Son bestows his Spirit on us. For the Son has the Spirit in himself. During his baptism he received the Spirit to preserve it in his Incarnate nature to implant it in us and to sanctify our whole human nature. We received the Spirit during creation, but when we transgressed we were stripped from the Holy Spirit and it departed from man. After the resurrection and after he ascended to the Father he bestowed the Holy Spirit to humanity again. The regeneration through the Spirit is done through partaking of the divine nature. The Spirit shares with the Son the property of life giving. Through the Incarnation we learn that the life giving Word who dwells in the flesh maintains the power to impart life to those who believe in him. This property of life giving shared by the Son and the Holy Spirit is the means by which newness of life is granted to humanity. The restoration of humanity is the aim of the Incarnation, is the aim of the Son, is the aim of the work of the Trinity, where all things are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.

[504] John Damascene *De fide orthodoxa* 1.8 (PG 94.789–1228).

CHAPTER 3

CYRIL'S EXEGETICAL METHOD

PART ONE: LITERARY EXEGESIS

Francis Young eloquently describes the process of exegesis as "partly 'taught' and partly 'caught.'"[505] The process of exegesis, as well as that of writing, is partly the product of the educational system and this is "taught." The place and method of education, as well as the historical context of the period shapes the writer's style, approach, and method of writing. The other component of exegesis and writing is influenced by the writer's personal input as nourished by personal experience, and affected by the historical and social setting and spiritual maturity. This is "caught." Thus, any approach to the study of a text has to be twofold: the literary part and the personal or spiritual part. The former is the process of writing that exhibits the literary norms of the period in which the text was written and reflects to what extent the writer followed these rules and to what degree the writer's innovative style can be detected. The latter is the personal input of the writer, which includes his personal erudition; and his choice of words that reflect his personal ideas and world-view. In addition, the text can reveal the writer's spirituality and theological disposition. It should be noted that this two step or twofold exegesis is an artificial division. The intellectual process of exegesis is the combination of both but spelled out separately in writing to facilitate for the readers what is intended by the text. Cyril was a teacher and clarifying his method was part of his aim. For the purpose of this study, we are going to refer to the first part as "Literal Exegesis" and the second part as "Spiritual Exegesis." A separate chapter will be dedicated to each component of exegesis. The present chapter is dedicated to researching

[505] Frances Young, "Exegetical Method and Scriptural Proof: The Bible in Doctrinal Debate," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989), 304.

what is meant by "literal exegesis" as presented in Cyril's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*.

Chapter One of this work argued that the literary education of a person, together with his moral and exemplary life, may make him a good candidate to be a reader in the church. The use of such provisions may encourage one to be an erudite person in scripture and be promoted to be a διδάσκαλος and assigned to be a "Gospel exegete." Since education is one of the key components that enables a person to delve into biblical texts and thus equip a person to be an exegete, the educational background that enabled Cyril to be such an exegete, was explained in the first chapter. At this point of the research, it is necessary to take a closer look at the Hellenistic educational system beyond what was discussed in Chapter One.

Since this study is based on a literary text, rather than an oral text preserved in writing, it is necessary to look more deeply on the rhetor's literary background that is primarily formed through grammar. Quintilian argued that "the two professions [that is, of the grammarians and rhetors] must each be assigned their proper sphere."[506] As discussed in the first chapter, the fine line between the "two professions" is blurred and there is a lot of overlapping between the two disciplines.[507] A general background of the grammarians' literary practices was described briefly in Chapter One; therefore, further elaboration on specific aspects of grammatical or rhetorical styles will be elaborated upon separately as this work deals in detail with Cyril's text.

Before launching into the comparative aspect of the research—between classical rhetoric and Cyril's writings—it is valuable to have a brief look at the present state of research and why this approach is useful for Cyrillian studies. According to Frances Young, Edwin Hatch was the first to argue, more than a hundred years ago, that the roots of patristic exegesis lie in the ancient educational system, and in the schools of the grammarians and rhetors. Hatch suggested the investigation into the influence of Greek

---

[506] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratio*, text and translation by H. E. Butler, 4 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920–2), 2.1.4–8.

[507] For further reading on the topic of rhetoric, Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in the Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959). George Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972). Idem, *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne, 1969). James Murphy, ed., *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric* (New York: Random House, 1972). Jeffrey Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). W. Rhys Roberts, *Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism* (New York: Cooper Square, 1963).

ideas on Christianity. This implied researching "the influence of Greek methods of exegesis on Christian exegesis, and on the debt of Christian preaching owed to Greek rhetoric."[508] The other studies that followed focused mainly on certain personages. It seems the persons that interested the researchers were those writers that were known to have achieved high rhetorical standards or worked as rhetors or grammarians before attaining their ecclesiastical position. The writers that have gained the greatest scholarly attention were Augustine, John Chrysostom,[509] and the Cappadocians[510] since all of them have surviving written orations on which scholars have data or information for their research. Some attention was

[508] Frances Young, "The Rhetorical Schools and their Influence on Patristic Exegesis," in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams, (Cambridge University Press, 1989): 182–3. Edwin Hatch, *The influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957).

[509] Some examples of research on rhetoric of John Chrysostom: T. E. Ameringer, *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom* (Patristic Studies 5; Washington, D.C., 1921). M. A. Burns, *Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of Their Rhetorical Qualities and Form* (Patristic Studies, 22; Washington, D.C. 1930). F. W. A. Dickson, *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. Chrysostom* (Patristic Studies. 11; Washington, D.C. 1926).

[510] Some examples of research on rhetoric of the Cappadocians: J. M. Campbell, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the style of the sermons of St. Basil the Great* (Patristic Studies, 2; Washington, D.C. 1922). G. H. Ettlinger, "The Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus: A Study in Rhetoric and Personality," in *Preaching in the Patristic Age: Studies in Honor of Walter J. Burghardt, S. J.*, ed. D. G. Hunter (New York, 1989), 101–18. A. B. Poynton, *Gregory of Nazianzus and the Greek Rhetoricians* (A Supplement to the Index of Walz, Rhetores Graeci, Vol. 9) (Oxford, 1933). R. R. Reuther, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford, 1969). M. Alexandre, "Le mortuis' de Gregoire de Nysse," *Studia Patristica*, X (TU, 107; Berlin 1970), 35–43. J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères cappadociens: Le prédicateur et son auditoire* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Université de Montpellier, 30; Monpellier, 1968).

given to Clement of Alexandria[511] and Tertullian[512] because of their polished literary styles.[513]

As for Cyril of Alexandria, knowledge of the history of his early education is very speculative since there is no concrete information about his early life, but his style of writing definitely presumes that he acquired an extremely high level of education. He was not known to have held the position of a rhetor or grammarian before being a bishop. In addition, his writings did not include any orations nor was he known to be an orator, in contrast to Augustine, Chrysostom, and the Cappadocians, whose orations fill many pages. Cyril could not have competed with these distinguished figures famous for their Christian oratory. There are only two modern studies that point to some aspects of Cyril's literary style. The first is Kerrigan's study in which he devoted only a meager part of his work to some of the literary aspects of Cyril's Old Testament exegetical works.[514] The second is Cassel, who, in his dissertation, argued that Cyril applied his grammarian skills to educate the clergy in the art of scriptural interpretation. The latter based his work on the *Commentary on Isaiah*. He used the commentary to point out some literary aspects that indicate that Cyril used the commentary as a medium of instruction since there are some indications in the text that it was presented orally.[515] To date, there is no

---

[511] An example of research on the rhetoric of Clement of Alexandria: J. David Cassel, "Cyril of Alexandria and the science of the grammarian: a study in the setting, purpose and emphasis of Cyril's Commentary on Isaiah," Ph.D. diss., Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1992..

[512] An example of research on the rhetoric of Tertullian: R. D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).

[513] In addition to the previous titles dedicated to specific Christian authors, here are examples of general research on rhetoric that is related to Christian themes: P. Auksi, *Christian Plain Style: The Evolution of a Spiritual* Ideal (Montreal, 1995). T. D. Barnes, "Panegyric, History, and Hagiography in Eusebius' Life of Constantine," in R. Williams ed., *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1989), 94–123. G. J. M. Bartelink, *Quelques observations sur ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ dans la littérature paléo-chrétienne* (Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva Sup., 3.1; Nijmegen, 1970). T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (Studies in Classical Philology, 3; Chicago, 1902), 89–261 (repr. New York/ London 1987 [Ancient Greek Literature]). M. L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey* (London, 1953). Ibid., *Higher education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971).

[514] A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament* (Rome, Institutum Pontificum Biblicum, 1952).

[515] J. David Cassel, "Cyril of Alexandria and the science of the grammarian: a study in the setting, purpose and emphasis of Cyril's Commentary on Isaiah,"

research dedicated to Cyril's rhetoric. Thus, these two chapters will be an attempt to contribute to the research on Cyril's exegesis with an emphasis on his rhetorical style.

Scholars have approached rhetoric from different perspectives. To take some recent examples, Peter Brown approached rhetoric from the viewpoint of "persuasion." He did not discuss the idea of persuasion from the literary perspective but rather as a political means in exerting power in the Roman Empire. He concentrated on the upper class control of power with special attention to the religious and cultural elements that played a role in the formation of the imperial power. He contended that *paideia* created a common culture among both the upper class and rulers and that bishops, who were learned in *paideia*, were able to replace the ruling power within their region. He also contends that Christian writers presented monks as a stratum in the society that were "untouched" by *paideia* and at the same time showed an element of power and control in the society. These uneducated monks shared with the bishops a new power that is determined by "the love of the poor" rather than *paideia*.[516] On the other hand, Avril Cameron has approached the topic from the view point of Christian usage of rhetoric. She studied the art of biography writing in Christian hagiography and how this art evolved to have a more visual form, that is, the art of iconography complemented this style of rhetoric. She also discussed the genre of "acts" that had a very specific literary quality that has set it apart from other literary genres. She writes that she is not using rhetoric "in its technical sense, but rather in the current, far looser sense it seems to have acquired, by which it can mean something like 'characteristic means or ways of expression'; these modes may be either oral or written, or indeed may pertain to the visual or to any other means of communications."[517] It is the "technical sense" that is going to be presently

---

Ph.D. diss., Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1992. J. David Cassel, "Cyril of Alexandria as Educator," in *In Dominico Eloquio: In Lordly Eloquence*, eds. Paul Blowers, Angela Russell Christman, David G. Hunter, and Robin Darling Young (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 348–68.

[516] Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity; Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992).

[517] Avril Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of the Empire* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1991), 13. For reading and reference works concerning the art or τέχνη of rhetoric refer to Quintilian, *Institutio Oratio*, text and translation by H. E. Butler, 4 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920–2). This research will refer continuously to Quintilian's work since it is considered a classic for such a topic, is more comprehensive in its coverage, and

discussed rather than a political, social, or artistic visual approach. This study will accept the general consensus of scholars in this field without delving into a detailed discussion about the various competing schools of rhetoric. There are no studies on Cyril's rhetorical style, and only when much research is done on the various styles of his writings would it be necessary to go into greater depth to investigate the possibility of whether Cyril is a follower of a certain school of rhetoric.[518]

The Literary Aspect of Cyril's *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*

To understand the literary facets of Cyril's commentary, one needs to examine in detail the literary aspects of rhetoric and investigate whether these aspects are present in the particular text under consideration and try to understand what type of genre the *Commentary on John* represents. Then we will attempt to understand the divisions within the text and see if they have any theological significance. Text division is part of the text invention since one should have a clear division of the text before venturing to start the interpretation as interpretation includes the process of division. Following that we will examine Cyril's literary style regarding grammar, interest in ἱστορία, that is, geography. In addition, the work will investigate Cyril's knowledge of Greek philosophy together with the method in which he argued against heretical dogmas. It should be noted that the results might appear to be less than clear-cut, because practical application of theory of rhetoric tends to deviate from the theoretical framework with the intention to accommodate the aim of the literature composed.

---

has summarized the work of previous rhetors. Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, ed. Dan O. Via (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990). Stanley Porter, ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[518] Sider in his work on Tertullian, and Colson before him, faced a similar challenge. Sider writes, "He [Colson] argued that the influence of rhetoric went much deeper than mere stylistic ornamentation, that it provided categories and distinctions which affected the structure of thought, and he called for a history describing the influence of rhetoric on the Fathers at the basic level of thought patterns. Perhaps Colson's challenge was too demanding: such a history can be written only after we have discovered the rhetorical basis of the thought of the individual writers." R. D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 2–3. And this is the challenge of this research: there is no "rhetorical basis of the thought of the individual writers" and to reach such an aim will require many research efforts in this field.

The Text as "Commentary"

Cyril clearly stated that he was writing "dogmatic exegesis" (δογματικωτέραν ... ἐξήγησιν).[519] The text under consideration is an exegetical work. The general tendency of the early church writers was to write exegetical works in the form of scholia, homilies, and commentaries. The best example of an Alexandrian writer who wrote exegetical works in all of these three forms is Origen. Jerome in his thirty-third Epistle mentions that Origen wrote scholia on Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus. Scholia (σχόλια) were written primarily for educational and instructional purposes in a school setting, as the word implies. They were a literary form used by previous Alexandrians, and Cyril was most probably aware of that genre. The second form of exegetical writings is the "homily" (ὁμιλίαι). Homilies were given in a liturgical setting. In most cases they were comments on the readings of the day; therefore, they usually commented on biblical passages selectively and, when put in written form and collected in one volume, did not usually cover the whole biblical text. Origen's homilies were taken down by stenographers, and an example of what is extant of them are twenty homilies on Jeremiah, thirteen on Exodus, sixteen on Leviticus, twenty-eight on Numbers, twenty-six on Joshua, nine on Judges, nine on Psalms, thirty-nine on Luke, and many others.[520] The last genre was that of commentaries (τόμοι). Quasten remarked that homilies' purpose was "popular edification" while commentaries were "written in order to give a scientific exegesis. They are a strange mixture of

[519] *In Jo.* 1.7. (δογματικωτέραν ... ἐξήγησιν) that is a "more dogmatic exegesis." Cyril is making it clear from the outset of his commentary that he will be more focused on dogmas that expose the false doctrines of the heretics. This is most probably in comparison to commentaries that tend to focus more on spirituality, literal, or mystical explanation of the text, or other religious interests. Though this commentary includes some spiritual advice, Cyril's main focus is on dogmatic issues. The early church literary genres were not clear cut in their genres. Thus biblical expositions would include many other topics, as much as the orator is capable of including. The most obvious would be that of John Chrysostom whose biblical expositions included many topics. It was the means that the shepherd spoke to his flock. Therefore, Cyril's clear presentation of a "more dogmatic" presentation indicates that he is going to focus on this issue more than anything else.

[520] Quasten, *Patrology*, 2.46–7. An impressive full list of Origen's surviving homilies is listed in Quasten.

philological, textual, historical, etymological notes and theological and philosophical observations."[521]

Quasten's remarks are clear in that a commentary was not written for the general public but served as some sort of reference work for the more learned who wanted a more in depth look at the biblical text. Furthermore, the list of the elements in the "strange mixture" that Quasten lists is nothing more than the elements of a literary rhetorical work. Origen wrote commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John, and some of the Pauline Epistles. He also wrote commentaries on some Old Testament texts and parts of the commentary on the Canticle of Canticles are still extant.[522] On the other hand, Didymus the Blind wrote only commentaries in the form of scholia. Moreover, there is no indication that Didymus wrote or delivered any homilies. It is interesting to note that the literary activity of the writer reflects his daily life preoccupation. Didymus the Blind's activities were confined to his school, most probably due to his handicap, and his literary activity reflects this.

Based on the previous exegetical categories, the exegetical text of the Gospel of John is a commentary. Cyril gave the heading of his commentary as ἑρμηνεία ἤτοι ὑπόμνημα.[523] It includes an interpretation, explanatory notes, and commentary. Cyril does not have any scholias. The extant authentic homilies attributed to Cyril have a Marian theme. The other extant series of authentic homilies that have an exegetical theme are those on the Gospel of Luke and they were clearly delivered after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy. They were short, uncomplicated, and expressed theological themes rather simply. Cyril was always aware of his listeners, and he frequently apologized when the homily tended to be long, being aware that his listeners were getting tired and most probably he felt from their body movement that they were beginning to lose concentration. He usually started with a summary of the previous day to remind his listeners where he last stopped. None of these characteristics were present in the Johannine commentary. The only two other exegetical works that Cyril wrote that are not in commentary form are *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* and *Glaphyra*. The former is in dialogue form and both addressed some passages in the Pentateuch. The rest of his exegetical work was in the form of commentaries, that on the Gospel of John being one of them. This is

---

[521] Ibid., 2.48. Quasten represents a certain attitude. This could be contrasted with the opinions of Henri De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis, vol 1: The Four Senses of Scripture*, translated by Mark Sebanc (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998).

[522] Ibid., 2.50.

[523] *In Jo.* 1.1.

another indication that Cyril produced his exegetical works before his episcopal years. They were written when he was in a mind set of not being concerned with homiletic responsibilities, nor obligated for daily teaching; thus, having to write in the form of scholia, but rather concerned with the study of scripture as a reader appointed to be a "Gospel exegete. "[524]

The Division of the Commentary

The Commentary was divided into a preface plus twelve books (βιβλίον). The preface was only seven pages.[525] Each book was divided into headings (κεφαλή) that explained the topics or argument to be discussed.[526] Taking into consideration that typed scripts are more homogeneous than written scripts, we can fairly assume that Cyril paced his writings so that every two books would cover about three hundred pages, on average, per bound volume. He must have taken into consideration the easy handling of a book, its binding, and other practical production constraints. However, it should be noted that the first book was limited to the theological division of

[524] Cassel's dissertation thesis considers the Commentary on Isaiah as a collection of exegetical lectures produced for educational purposes. The result of this research shows disagreement with Cassel's thesis that Cyril wrote his commentaries for educational purposes to teach the elements of exegesis to the priests of Egypt or interested advanced students. If this was the purpose, Cyril would have written his commentaries in the form of scholia. Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 58.

[525] The pages referred to are pages of the Pussey edition. The page of this edition will be considered as the measuring unit by which we measure the length of the text and its divisions.

[526] The division of the books is as follows:

1.	Book 1: Jn 1:1–28	Vol. 1; Ps 1–168	number of pages: 168
2.	Book 2: Jn 1:29–5:34.	Vol. 1; Ps 69–362	number of pages: 293
3.	Book 3: Jn 5:35–6:37	Vol. 1; Ps 365–481	number of pages: 116
4.	Book 4: Jn 6:38–7:24	Vol. 1; Ps 485–644	number of pages: 159
5.	Book 5: Jn 7:25–8:43	Vol. 1; Ps 647–728 + Vol. 2 Ps 1–90 number of pages: 171	
6.	Book 6: Jn 8:44–10:17	Vol. 2; Ps 91–241	number of pages: 150
7.	Book 7: Jn 10:18–12:2	Vol. 2; Ps 243–299	[fragments]
8.	Book 8: Jn 12:2–12:48	Vol. 2; Ps 301–334	[fragments]
9.	Book 9: Jn 12:49–14:20	Vol. 2; Ps 338–488	number of pages: 150
10.	Book 10: Jn 14:21–16:13	Vol. 2; Ps 489–629	number of pages: 170
11.	Book 11: Jn 16:13–18:23	Vol. 2; Ps 629–737 + Vol. 3; Ps 1–40 number of pages: 148	
12.	Book 12: Jn 18:24–21:25	Vol. 2; Ps 43–171	number of pages: 128

the Prologue of John. Therefore, from the physical evidence, we can assume that he had the prologue as a volume of its own. Book Two was also a volume of its own that was around three hundred pages. The rest of the books were bound together in twos, where each volume would average three hundred pages. The two missing books, Books Seven and Eight, confirm this theory. If we take, for example, the transition from Book Two to Book Three, it is in the middle of the pericope about Christ being the "Bread of Life." However, since Books Three and Four were to be bound together in one volume, Cyril did not find it unusual to end the book in the middle of the pericope. This is in comparison to the division between Book One and Two, in which he made a conclusion at the end of the pericope. The same situation was present in the division between Books Five and Six, where the book ends at the middle of the pericope, in comparison to Book Six that ends at the conclusion of a pericope. Therefore, book divisions were carefully crafted to take into consideration the practical limitations of book production in addition to the internal division of the biblical text.

The Division of the Gospel Text

The early parts of the Gospel narrative absorbed Cyril's attention, and by the time he reached the end of his commentary he was almost narrating the text without many explications since all his theological views were already clearly and repetitively mentioned throughout the commentary. The first verse of the Gospel of John was interpreted in three chapters. The second verse in the same Gospel required a whole chapter of interpretation. Cyril used the first verse to explain the "orthodox" faith. Once he felt that he set the foundation of his theological argument, Cyril began launching his attacks on the heretics beginning with Eunomius starting with verse two (Jn 1:2). In the following verses Cyril concentrated his arguments against the Arian heresy. The beginning of Chapter Nine of his book was devoted to a very detailed argument against Origen. Cyril's commentary was a "dogmatic exegesis" interpretation, and the first book of his commentary set the foundation and the tone for the rest of his text. Thus, in the first book of the commentary, Cyril intentionally outlined the basics of the "orthodox" faith and challenged the heretical teachings.[527] By the time Cyril reached the

[527] It should be noted that due to the theological content of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, many early Christian writers devoted much attention to the first chapter of John. John Chrysostom devoted the first twenty-one homilies of a total of eighty-three to the first chapter of John. That is about one fourth of his homiletic attention was given to John 1. PG 59. Origen devoted the first nine

last book of his commentary, he laid clear all his arguments and narrated the last chapters of the Gospel for the sake of completion.

Books Three, Four, and Five each interpret almost one chapter, in contrast to the rest of the commentary where a book commented on two or more Gospel chapters. What is significant about Books Three and Four is that they included within them long treatises about Old Testament topics. Book Three contained two separate treatises—one on Moses[528] and the other on manna.[529] Book Four held three separate treatises, the tabernacle,[530] the Sabbath,[531] and circumcision.[532] Book Five paid special attention to the Arian heresy. Therefore, Books Three, Four, and Five were tailored to address certain topics that were of interest to Cyril.

We can conclude that he arranged his commentary as follows. The first book was the foundation of his arguments. Book Two was an extension of this elaboration and the division between Books One and Two was solely for practical reasons. Books Three, Four, and Five, were devoted to special topics that he wanted to address and he approached them in the form of separate treatises. Books Seven and Eight are fragments, and therefore it is difficult to make concrete statements about their contents. By the time Cyril began writing his last four books, he had already laid down his theological framework and he began to attend more to exegesis of spirituality and practical daily life.[533] For example, Jn 14:24, *Whoever does not love me does not keep my words* was an opportunity for Cyril to exhort his readers to follow the commandments as he considers this to be a particular state of virtue (τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἶδός) where one participates in the Divine nature.[534] The contents of the Gospel message helped him to pursue such a course. This was the same with Book Eleven where the theme of the Holy Spirit was key in the chapter and Cyril used it, together with his emphasis on theological

---

books of a total of thirty-two books, that is, about a third of the text, to the first chapter of John. SC vols. 120, 157, and 222.

[528] *In Jo.* 1.391–440. Bk 3, chs 3 and 4.

[529] *In Jo.* 1. 456–481. Bk 3, ch 6.

[530] *In Jo.* 1.562–578. Bk 4, ch 4.

[531] *In Jo.* 1.615–627 Bk 4, ch 6.

[532] *In Jo.* 1.628–644. Bk 4, ch 7. The research will deal with each of the above mentined treatises in the following chapter dealing with "spiritual exegesis" under the heading of the "Use of the Old Testament" in Cyril's exegesis.

[533] Cassel was of the opinion that the divisions of the books of the *Commentary on Isaiah* were arbitrary and without any logic. Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 54.

[534] *In Jo.* 2.502.

doctrines, to embellish some spiritual themes. Book Twelve was devoted to the last days of Christ and Cyril tended to follow the historical narrative to a great extent with the occasional embellishment of spiritual themes.[535]

Two illustrations will clarify the contrast between the approach in Book One and Book Twelve. In comparison to the first book, where he divided one verse into two chapters, we notice that in Book Twelve he took at least seven verses at one time. For example, he dealt with Jn 21:7–14 as one segment.[536] This segment was more narrative in style where the passage describes Christ's appearance to the seven disciples while fishing and the catch of the one hundred fifty-three fish. At this point, Cyril seized the opportunity to elaborate in a way that was quite outstanding for his method. Cyril explained that the ignited fire was done to prove to the Apostles that it was the Savior who started the work of preaching and not them.[537] He then elaborated on the meaning of the number of the hundred and fifty-three fish.[538] One hundred is a perfect number. Cyril presented two possible explanations for this number. One hundred could have signified the complete sum of rational creatures (having in mind the hundred sheep in the parable of the good shepherd), or the fertility of the righteous soul. The number fifty referred to the elect remnant of the people of Israel, since fifty

---

[535] Cyril's writing was extremely theological by its very nature, so when we write that Cyril tended to follow the last days of Christ more on the historical side, that does not mean that there were no theological arguments involved. For example, in the previous chapter we mentioned that Cyril was the only early church writer who was able to reconcile the two narratives of the descent of the Holy Spirit. This was explained in Book Twelve. What is meant by following the historical narrative is that it was comparatively, theologically less complex than the early part of the commentary. It is a comparison between the beginning and the end of the work, and not an absolute statement that the end of the commentary was less theological.

[536] There are many other examples that cannot be enumerated. A quick glance at the Appendix will clearly reveal the difference of length in the segment divisions throughout the commentary.

[537] *In Jo.* 3.161.

[538] The early church writers showed great interest in the interpretation of numbers. For example, Origen discussed in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John* some interpretation of numbers as in the building of the temple. Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, translated by Roland Hiene. The Fathers of the Church, vol 80 (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 316. Another example is that of Evagrius who divided his book *Chapters on Prayer* into 153 chapters in imitation of the 153 fish caught by the disciples after the resurrection. Evagrius Ponticus, *The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer*, trans. John Eudes Bamberger (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1981).

is half of one hundred and falls short of the perfect hundred. Three referred to the Trinity.[539] In this segment Cyril did not elaborate on dogmatic issues, as was his custom in the early parts of his commentary but rather focused on the more spiritual and allegorical aspects of the scriptural message.

Another example can also be found in Book Twelve, where Cyril commented in Jn 19:23–4 on the divided garments. Cyril wrote that the divided garment might signify the mysterious providence that the four quarters of the world are destined to be saved. Though he later pursued a theological interpretation that Christ cannot be divided, he quickly reverted to elaborate that the seamless robe refers to the fact that Christ's body came to existence in the world without intercourse.[540]

As mentioned above, this text is a "commentary." Christian writers followed the same steps as secular grammarians' commentary procedure on Scriptures. In Jones's opinion, "Most of these follow too faithfully the tradition of the secular *grammaticus*, explaining the text line by line and word by word and commenting on obscurities with much pedantic learning."[541] Dionysius Thrax was of the opinion that any reader who is trained in a grammarians' school and acquired the basic grammarian's skills will be able to read and analyze a text.[542] The importance of Dionysius Thrax for this research is that many of his papyri have been found in Egypt[543] and thus we may assume that his theory of the art of interpretation might have been familiar to Cyril. Dionysius' six parts of rhetoric or the art or τέχνη of grammatical analysis of text are,

> 1- expect reading of the text with its correct accents and punctuation; 2- explication (ἐξήγησις) of the poetic tropes which occur in the text; 3- the appropriate definition of both the rare and unusual words and the historical aspects of the text; 4- research (εὕρεσις) into etymologies; 5- reflection on analogies;

---

[539] *In Jo.* 3.160–3.

[540] *In Jo.* 3. 87–9.

[541] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, p1011. For a similar analysis of Cyril's Commentary on Isaiah refer to Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 73. Young explained that Quintilian is one of the most informative sources for us to understand the methods of exegesis as practiced in the schools of the grammarians. She says that Quintilian was of the opinion that "correct reading precedes interpretation." She explains further that correct reading is a process of interpretation "since words were not divided, there was no punctuation and not all hand written copies in the class would be identical." Young, *Rhetorical Schools*, 184.

[542] Cassel, *Cyril as Educator*, 352.

[543] Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 136.

> and 6- the evaluation (κρίσις) of the work, which is the most elegant of all the parts of the science. (*Ars Grammatica* 1.4–8).[544]

Thus, according to Dionysius Thrax, the process of interpretation included, after a careful reading of the text, dividing the text, that is, deciding on the punctuation, looking at some grammatical issues, and attesting the correctness of the text to be worked upon. Also this included attending to obscurities and Cyril was fascinated with explaining the names and locations of obscure towns and cities. We will thus investigate whether Cyril followed the τέχνη required of the grammarian to analyze the text.

Cyril's *Commentary on John* follows the principle of commenting word by word on the text. The whole Gospel text can be reconstructed from the Commentary.[545] He began a book by listing the headings (κεφαλή) or topics he intended to discuss. He then began his chapter by citing the heading (κεφαλή) again and listing the verse, half verse, or more than one verse, that he intended to explicate followed with the interpretation. We will now take a closer look at Cyril's choice of verse division.

The first verse division that involved an exegetical decision was Jn 1:3,4. The verse reads as follows: πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Metzger poses the question: "Should the words ὃ γέγονεν be joined with what goes before or with what follows?"[546] Metzger remarked that manuscripts did not have punctuation, and any punctuation reflected the "exegetical understanding of the meaning of the passage."[547] Metzger provided these further remarks: there is a general consensus among ante-Nicene writers, whether they are orthodox or heretical, to attach ὃ γέγονεν with what follows. At this point we can conclude that Cyril followed the ante-Nicene consensus. On the other hand, the Arians and Macedonians customarily attached ὃ γέγονεν with what precedes to interpret that the Holy Spirit was created. This led the following writers to attach ὃ γέγονεν with what follows to avoid such heretical interpretation.[548] Modern editions attach ὃ γέγονεν with what precedes and end the verse after ὃ γέγονεν. As

---

[544] Quoted in Cassel, *Cyril as Educator*, 352–3. [insertion of Greek in text is mine] Alfredus Hilgard, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, Part I vol. 3 (Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1901), 13–16.

[545] The Appendix has reconstructed Cyril's Johannine text, showing textual variants.

[546] Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: American Bible Society, 1994), 167.

[547] Ibid.

[548] Ibid.

to Cyril, he attached ὅ γέγονεν with what follows and devoted the whole of Chapter Six of Book One to this verse ὅ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. Clearly Cyril has made it an exegetical point against the Arians to interpret the verse in this form.

Another example is that in the printed modern editions we have Jn 5: 36–38 divided as follows:

> 36 But I have a testimony greater than John's. The works that the Father has given me to complete, the very works that I am doing, testify on my behalf that the Father has sent me. 37 And the Father who sent me has himself testified on my behalf. You have never heard his voice or seen his form, 38 and you do not have his word abiding in you, because you do not believe him whom he has sent.

Cyril considered verse thirty-six and the first half of thirty-seven as one unit. There were two testimonies for the Son, one is that of John and the other is that of the Father. The completion of the testimony of the Father ends in the middle of verse thirty-seven. Cyril considered that the testimony of John and the Father constitute one exegetical unit. Cyril interpreted the rest of the verses focusing on the Jewish leaders who did not understand what was said by Moses, since they neither heard nor saw Him. The division had great consequences for the subsequent interpretation.

A similar example is found in Jn 6:27. The verse was situated after the episode of the feeding of the five thousand and followed by Christ's comment that he was the "Bread of Life." Verse twenty-seven is amid these two pericopes and reads, *Do not work for the food that perishes, but for the food that endures for eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you. For it is on him that God the Father has set his seal* (Jn 6:27). In Chapter Four, Cyril focused on the miracle of feeding the multitude. He concluded the pericope with the assertion that, though Christ fed all those present with food that perishes, it is time that we focus our attention to the eternal food that is more mystical and sanctifies us totally, body and soul.[549] On this note Cyril ended Chapter Four. He concluded the chapter discussing half of verse twenty-seven. Chapter Five began with the focus on the verb "being a seal" (ἐσφράγισεν). He turned the discussion from the mystical setting of the eternal bread to the theological setting of asserting the oneness of Christ with the Father, for He is the Only Begotten who is the impress and seal of the Father. The main topic of Chapter Five was the Son being the seal (ἐσφράγισεν) of the Father.[550] It can be suggested that when Cyril finds a topic that is of interest

[549] *In Jo.* 1.438–440.
[550] *In Jo.* 1. 441–455.

to the main σκοπός of his work, in this case a dogmatic Trinitarian aim, he does not hesitate to devote the entire chapter to the topic. There are numerous examples to illustrate that verse division affects interpretation. These two examples will suffice to illustrate the point.

There is another way of dividing the verses that does not necessarily make a substantial theological difference, but rather makes more rhetorical sense in interpreting the verses. Jn 20:11–13 are divided as follows:[551]

> 11 But Mary stood weeping outside the tomb.// As she wept, she bent over to look into the tomb; 12 and she saw two angels in white sitting where the body of Jesus had been lying, one at the head and the other at the feet. 13 They said to her, "Woman, why are you weeping?" She said to them,// "They have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they have laid him." 14 When she had said this, she turned around and saw Jesus standing there, but she did not know that it was Jesus.[552]

Cyril's first division described the situation of Mary: she was weeping and located outside the tomb. The second division included the arrival of the angels and their initiating a conversation with her. The third part detailed Mary's response and reaction. It is the image of a stage scene where the change of character indicated a shift on the stage focus. In the first and third parts, Mary was the figure at the center of the stage. In the second part, the angels were playing their role on stage.

The example just mentioned sets the foundation for another criterion of division in Cyril's commentary. The previous example did not affect the theological outcome, but is rather a result of rhetorical understanding of the role of the persons dominating the scene. The following example is an illustration of a division due to change in the stage of events but is affected by theological understandings. When Cyril began commenting on Jn 6:1, *After this Jesus went to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, also called the sea of Tiberias*, he started as follows. The verse is the beginning of Book Three, Chapter Four. The heading (κεφαλή) of the Chapter clearly stated the theological significance of this verse. He writes, "That many times the departures of Christ from Jerusalem make clear the transferring of his grace to the Gentiles."[553] Cyril explained that Christ left Jerusalem for a reason. During his stay in Jerusalem he healed the man who had an infirmity for thirty-eight

---

[551] The numbers are the modern printed division. The double slash "//" refers to Cyril's division.

[552] *In Jo.* 3.110–113.

[553] Ὅτι πολλάκις αἱ Χριστοῦ μεταβάσεις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὸ μετατεθήσεσθαι τὴν χάριν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη δηλοῦσιν· *In Jo.* 1.397.

years. Christ healed the infirmed man on a Sabbath and this caused a disturbance in the city that was incited by the Jewish leaders. Cyril posed the question what does "after this" mean? It means that after the disturbance caused by the healing on the Sabbath, Christ left Jerusalem.[554] Thus, Cyril concluded that when Christ leaves the scene in Jerusalem and crosses the Sea of Galilee after the ungrateful Jewish leaders accuse him of transgressing the Sabbath rather than thanking him for healing the paralytic, it is a sign of transference of Grace from the Jews to the Gentiles. This might be considered allegorical interpretation, but it included the reality of physical movement from one place to another and therefore the stage of events is emptied of its players. Different peoples inhabited these locales, the Jews in Jerusalem, and the Gentiles across the Sea of Galilee. For Cyril this indicates the transferring of Grace to the Gentiles who live across the Sea of Galilee. For Cyril it signified the beginning of a new chapter in Book Three.

Another similar example is Jn 9:1, *As he walked along, he saw a blind man from birth*. The very last verse in Jn 8:59 spoke about an attempt to stone Christ in the temple, but he disappeared from Jewish leaders. Cyril connected Jn 8:59 to Jn 9:1 and at the conclusion of Jn 9:1 he ended his discussion and began a new chapter in Book Six. Cyril interpreted Christ's leaving the temple because of the blindness of the Jews who could not understand the message. They were like the blind man who was blind from birth. He then connected verses Jn 8:59 to Jn 9:1 with the theme of blindness and this theme included the scene of leaving the temple locale and moving out of the traditional Jewish precinct.[555] Cyril's combination of the biblical verses was greatly influenced by his exegesis.

The final observation concerning the division of verses in Cyril's commentary regarded the last three books. As previously mentioned, the early books of the commentary were lengthy interpretations and the division of verses has, in most cases, affected the exegetical process. As to the last three books of the commentary, Cyril was more cursory in his approach. He felt that he explained in detail most of the theological dogmas, the verse division follows to a great extent the divisions of the modern printed editions. A look at the appendix will confirm this observation.

---

[554] *In Jo.* 1.397–8.
[555] *In Jo.* 2.133–5.

Grammar

Included in the reading process of the text—together with the text division—is the process where the grammarian certifies a text is attested and explains grammatical obscurities. The effect of grammar on interpretation included his use of the definite article, his punctuation and restructuring of verses, and his textual critical insights. This process is the second aspect of Dionysius Thrax's first point regarding the reading of the text.

Cyril wrote the following observations on the Johannine text. Commenting on Jn 1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος he gave a grammatical explanation in response to the heretics, by which, in this case, he meant Arius, who did not consider the Son to be the Word of the Father. To do so, Cyril argued that when Divine Scriptures put nouns with prefixed articles (τὰ ὀνόματα προταττομένων τῶν ἄρθων) then it meant something that was truly (ἀληθινῶς) what was said to be.[556] The article made the noun more defined than just the general and non-specific noun. Cyril offered an example to clarify what he meant. He said there are many gods, but when the noun God is prefixed with an article, then "He Who is" is signified.[557] Therefore, when *The Son of Man* was defined with an article, we understand that he meant only one and that is the Word. Therefore, when Scripture writes, *In the beginning was the Word*, then it is clear that the verse refers to the Son who is of the same essence as that of the Father.[558] Cyril followed this argument all through his commentary.

The consistency of the article argument can be demonstrated by another example where presence of an article before a noun, especially the divine name, whether it is God or Jesus, is so consistent that it is interesting to question, whether it is a textual variant in Cyril's personal copy or whether it is reverence to the name. When comparing Chapter Eleven of John's Gospel in Cyril's text with the Nestle-Aland edition it is found that the name Ἰησοῦς is prefixed with an article six times, in Jn 11:9,33,38,45,46,51, where verse forty-five has both the name Ἰησοῦς and a prefixed article added to the text. The Nestle-Aland edition does not attest to any variants to Jn 11:33, 38, 45, 51. On the other hand, Jn 11: 9,46 does have a variant that attests to such possible additions.[559]

---

[556] *In Jo.* 1.59.

[557] Ibid.

[558] Ibid.

[559] *In Jo.* 2.263–297. Further examples can be observed in the Appendix.

Cyril commented on Thomas' utterance ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου in Jn 20:28 that this is to show that there is only One Lord and One God.[560] Cyril argued that Thomas gave an answer with an article to eliminate any suspicion that he is addressing an angel or an important person. Cyril reminded his readers that Paul acknowledged that *in fact there are many gods and many lords* (1 Cor 8:5). Cyril goes on to explain that because of this faith, Christ instructed his disciples to preach to the nations and to assert that he is Lord and God by nature even when he became man (κύριος γὰρ ὄντως ἐστὶ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ Θεὸς καὶ ὅτε γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος).[561] Though the disciples touched him physically, they did not sever him into two sons but recognized him as the same in the flesh.[562] In this case, Cyril used the presence of the article in the text to assert a theological principle he dearly held, that is, the oneness of Christ. A similar idea is found in Jn 6:68 which reads according to Cyril's text καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν, καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ where ὁ Χριστὸς is absent from the Nestle-Aland but he attests that the variant is found in other manuscripts including a Boharaic one.[563] Cyril alerted his readers to observe that σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is singular and has a prefixed article (μοναδικῶς καὶ προτεταγμένου τοῦ ἄρθρου).[564] Based on this observation, he affirmed again that this is to remove any doubts about those who are called sons by grace, for there is only one Son who is truly Son.[565] Cyril again asserted the oneness of Christ. For example, Cyril commented that in the verse *ἐγω εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* (Jn 8:12) using the definite article refers directly to Christ for he is *the Light*.[566] The presence of the article emphasized the specificity of the light and that it is not any light. The attention to grammatical details such as the definite article clearly played a theological role in the interpretation.

Another aspect of Cyril's grammatically astute remarks can be observed in his comments on punctuation and grammar. Jn 5:39 reads ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς δοκεῖτε ὑμεῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν, καὶ αὗταί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρὸς μὲ, ἔχητε.[567] Cyril explained that the verb ἐρευνᾶτε (to search) was usually

[560] *In Jo.* 3.151.
[561] *In Jo.* 3.152.
[562] Ibid.
[563] *In Jo.* 1.574.
[564] *In Jo.* 1.576.
[565] Ibid.
[566] *In Jo.* 2.325–6.
[567] *In Jo.* 1.383.

interpreted in the imperative mood, as if Christ was ordering the Pharisees to search the scripture. Cyril said that the presence of the conjunction καὶ persuades us to look at the verse differently. According to Cyril, the meaning conveyed is that they search scriptures because they are convinced that they will find eternal life, then Christ blames them for although the search led to Him, they refuse Him and choose not to come to Him.[568] This interpretation did not imply the imperative mood. Modern scholars have reached a similar conclusion where the verb "search" is not translated in most versions in the imperative mood.

In the following example, Cyril suggested a change in the punctuation already common to most readers. Jn 7:21 reads ἓν ἔργον ἐποίησα καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε; and Cyril began his comment by suggesting that he is going to read the above mentioned statement as a question, rather than with a comma, or with a full stop.[569] Cyril reads it as a question that would mean, "I have healed the man on the Sabbath and do you marvel?" Thus he interprets the passage as if Jesus is asking whether they condemn the miracle-worker and are not looking at the miracle itself for the sake of the Sabbath. Nestle-Aland attested that there are variations in the punctuation. Therefore, Cyril was not the only one who attempted to suggest the question mark as the proposed solution.[570]

They said to him, "Who are you?" ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ Σὺ τὶς εἶ; (Jn 8:25). Cyril suggested that the reading of this verse, which is the way it is punctuated now in modern printed texts as well as that of Cyril, should be a question with a note of admiration. To achieve this Cyril suggested that the acute accent on the word σὺ be thrown back so that the emphasis would be on the σὺ.[571] For the Jewish leaders question Christ in a tone that implies that he is a worthless person and this punctuation would achieve such a message.

In another reading, Cyril wrote that many readers, when reading Jn 7:23, were unable to decide how to divide it so as to make of it a clear reading. Cyril informed his readers that he was going to divide the verse into short segments with the aim of clarifying the meaning. Cyril understood that the lack of punctuation and thus the lack of divisions in the verse make reading and comprehending the meaning of texts difficult. He therefore proceeds to the very main task of the grammarian. Cyril gave this

---

[568] *In Jo.* 383–4.

[569] *In Jo.* 1.611.

[570] Some modern English translations, such as the NRSV, does not suggest a question mark.

[571] *In Jo.* 2.22–3.

first suggestion to the verse, *if a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath, are you angry at me, that the Law of Moses should not be broken, because I made a whole man well on the Sabbath?*[572] Cyril wrote that Jn 7:22 informs us that *Moses gave you circumcision (it is, of course, not from Moses, but from the patriarchs), and you circumcise a man on the Sabbath*, that is, circumcision is not from Moses but the fathers. Thus, the circumcision of the fathers broke the Sabbath as written in the Law of Moses.[573] Based on this argument Cyril suggests the following reading, *are you angry at me, that the Law of Moses should not be broken, because I made a whole man well on the Sabbath?*[574] At this point Cyril is satisfied that he reached a convincing subdivision and provided a reasonable meaning; he thus began to elaborate on the interpretation.

The previous few examples illustrate the grammarian's work, and show that attention to the literary aspects of the text is part of the interpretive method. Another aspect is textual attestation, that is, to critically investigate the correctness of the text. This is still within the first point of Dionysius Thrax's method. The first example we have is Jn 1:41. According to Cyril's text it reads as follows: εὑρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτος τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνὰ.[575] The Nestle-Aland text reads πρῶτον. Metzger presented the following argument for the choice of πρῶτον. Πρῶτος "means that Andrew was the first follower of Jesus who made a convert." While πρῶτον "means that the first thing that Andrew did after having been called was to find his brother."[576] Based on this argument the Committee agreed to use πρῶτον instead of πρῶτος. In the meantime, we have πρῶτος in Cyril's text. Based on Metzger's argument we expect Cyril to interpret the text as Andrew being the first to make a convert. Cyril commented that Andrew made good use of his talent (τάλαντον) and explains to his brother the whole mystery and thus saves his brother (ἀνασώζει).[577] Therefore, Cyril decided on the interpretation that is linguistically in accord with his text.

The following example is taken from Book Eight that was collected from fragments. Therefore, the comments in consideration are to be taken

---

[572] *In Jo.* 1.615.

[573] Ibid.

[574] *In Jo.* 615–6. Which is translated in the NRSV as "If a man receives circumcision on the sabbath in order that the law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry with me because I healed a man's whole body on the Sabbath?"

[575] Which is translated in the NRSV as "He first found his brother Simon and said to him, "We have found the Messiah" (which is translated anointed)." Where in the modern edition "first" is the translation of πρῶτον.

[576] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 172.

[577] *In Jo.* 1.195.

with caution. The Cyrillian text writes Jn 12:28, Πατὲρ, δόξασόν σου τὸν Υἱόν.[578] Further on, Cyril commented that he was aware of another textual variant where Christ cries to the Father to δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα.[579] He then gave some sort of a casual statement and quickly proceeded with his argument. Cyril wrote that whether the text contains *glorify thy Son* or *glorify thy name* is a matter pertaining to scientific precision (ταὐτόν ἐστι τῇ τῶν θεωρημάτων ἀκριβείᾳ).[580] What this statement means, is that he is not interested in going into details on the basis that such an activity is a science of its own. It was highly unusual for Cyril to treat a textual variant that casually, or to proceed with his interpretation without stating which variant he preferred, as observed in the previous examples. Cyril usually exhibited a tendency to interpret texts meticulously.

Geography

Explaining obscure things in a text was part of the art (τέχνη) of the grammarian. This is the third point of Dionysius Thrax's previously mentioned τέχνη of grammatical analysis. Historical events and geographical locations were an integral part of the grammarian's training in exegesis. Cyril is exceptionally interested in geography and various scholars have noticed this interest.[581] His geographical knowledge was primarily from his erudition as a good grammarian. We know of three visits Cyril made outside of Egypt. The first was to Constantinople in 403 when he accompanied his uncle Theophilus to the Council of the Oak. His second major trip was to Ephesus in 431 where the famous council convened to resolve the Nestorian controversy. His last trip was to Jerusalem in 438, at the age of sixty, when he accompanied the Empress Eudocia on her

[578] *In Jo.* 2:315.

[579] Nestle Aland in its apparatus also notes the presence of the two variances.

[580] *In Jo.* 2.318. Cassel commented that when Cyril used the terms ταὐτόν ἐστι he usually employed it in the sense of introducing a definition or explanation of words. Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 171. Cyril did not seem to follow such a usage in this example which raises more doubts to the authenticity of this fragment.

[581] The most notably F. M. Abel, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la Palestine," 205–230, and "La géographie sacrée chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue Biblique* 31 (1992):407–427. Kerrigan also devoted a segment in his research to "Cyril's interest in geography." Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 322–333.

pilgrimage.[582] Since we know that Cyril died in 444 at the age of sixty-six, his trip to Jerusalem was only six years before his death. Moreover, since Cyril's exegetical writings were completed early in his literary career, then we can fairly assume that the historical and geographical description and information presented to us in *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* was primarily from his erudition, for by that time he had not yet visited Jerusalem.

Cyril was of the opinion that those who deprecate the historical (ἱστορίαν) aspects in the divine Scriptures and consider it as out of date, deprive themselves of the full understanding of the essence of Scriptures. Due to the fact that historical events were presented to us in Scriptures, it is fit to pursue their benefit and seek their salvific attributes.[583] Therefore, Cyril's scholarly training and his personal convictions make it worth while to pursue the presence of his geographical and historical understanding in his theological interpretation.

Since the texts that are under discussion are exegetical texts, the locales that are under discussion encompass the area where biblical events took place, that is, Palestine, Egypt, and Syria. Abel's article focused on these three geographical locations. He concluded that Cyril's knowledge of Egyptian geography is, not surprisingly, perfect. Cyril was also comfortable in discussing the Egyptian gods mentioned in any biblical text.[584] In regard to Palestine, Abel named the cities mentioned in the Bible and tried to investigate Cyril's sources of information and how Cyril described the location of cities. According to Abel, Cyril rarely consulted the *Onomasticon* or Περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν by Eusebius which came to be a kind of common reference for many Christian writers of the time.[585] In addition, Abel suggested some dependence on Didymus the Blind and Jerome.[586] Abel followed the same method of investigation regarding the Syrian cities.[587] Abel's study focused primarily on the Commentaries on Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, and Jonah.[588] Furthermore, Abel's research focused on

---

[582]Abel, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la Palestine," 224, 230.

[583] *Commentary on Isaiah*, PG 70.192A.

[584] Abel, "La géographie sacrée," 408–412. Abel discussed in greater detail Cyril's knowledge of Egyptian gods like Apis, and the Sun, or Ὼν. Also, Cyril clearly understood the impact of the Nile on the life in Egypt.

[585] Ibid., 408.

[586] Ibid., 408.

[587] Ibid., 422–427.

[588] Jonah's book is referred to solely for discussing the city of Tarshish.

Old Testament commentaries, and addressed the sources of his information on city location.[589] We will thus turn to the *Commentary on John* and investigate some of Cyril's geographical textual concerns and whether this affected his interpretation in any way.

An example of Cyril's interest in geographical details is located in Jn 6:1 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ιησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος.[590] This is different from Nestle-Aland's text of Jn 6:1, μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ιησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος.[591] Cyril's text has solved the problem and omitted Galilee. Cyril's text did not make it necessary to draw a distinction between the "sea of Tiberias" and the "sea of Galilee." There was no reference in *his* text to the "sea of Galilee." In Cyril's view, the problem of the text, as he has it, is clarifying to what sea it refers. Since he was an Egyptian, and the major Sea that is relevant to Egypt is the Mediterranean, combining the word "sea" with Tiberias might lead some to think of a vast body of salt water equivalent in area to that of the Mediterranean. Lest his readers fall into such a dilemma, Cyril wrote that John the Evangelist, calls the Lake (λίμνην) of Tiberias a sea (θάλασσαν).[592] He offered a scriptural explanation that the gathering of water in the creation narrative was called *sea*

---

[589] Cassel, in his work, devoted to the *Commentary on Isaiah* also noted Cyril's interest in geography. As mentioned above, a grammarian's interest in ἱστορία included interest in history and geography among other aspects. On this basis, Cassel investigated Cyril's reference to the history of Israel, references to historical context, and references to specific historical events. As to geography, Cassel took note of how Cyril distinguished between the sea (θάλασσα) and the seacoast (παραλία). Ibid., 189. He also explains what was meant by the "Rivers of Ethiopia," where Carthage is located. Cassel concluded his research on ἱστορία by commenting on the scientific and agricultural allusions in Isaiah. Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 175–196.

[590] *In Jo.* 1.397.

[591] Metzger comments that "the clumsiness of the two successive genitives, both identifying the same sea, prompted some copyists to omit *τὴς Γαλιλαίας*" Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 181. NRSV translation already included an interpretation in the process, where Jn 6:1 reads, *After this Jesus went to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, also called the Sea of Tiberias*. Cassel quotes Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah* concerning the Lake Tiberias, "One must be aware that the Holy Scripture calls Lake Tiberias 'the Sea of Galilee,' the very place where the godly disciples were found practicing the art of fishermen." Cassel, *Cyril and the Science of the Grammarians*, 190.

[592] *In Jo.* 1.403.

(συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων θαλάσσας).[593] He wrote that non-Christian writers used the word indifferently, and did not hesitate to call the lake a sea. It is clear that he was referring to the general poetic use following Homer who used the term λιμνέια to mean *sea.*[594] His literal elucidation of the term clarified the meaning in reference to his readers living in close proximity to the Mediterranean and in reference to the classic use of the term.

Cyril's geographical knowledge not only clarified the meaning, but also affected his interpretation. A good example would be Jn 4:43–45. After the Evangelist narrates the story of the Samaritan woman he continued to tell his readers that Christ departed to Galilee, and at his arrival in Galilee, the Galileans welcomed him because they saw the great miracles that he did in Jerusalem, since some of them attended the feast. The narrative would be consistent had not the flow of the journey from Samaria to Galilee been interrupted in Jn 4:44, with Christ saying that a prophet has no honor in his own country. Cyril explained the reason for such an unexpected comment from Christ since it seems to be out of context. Cyril wrote that Christ passed by Nazareth that lies in the middle (διὰ μέσου κειμένην παρατρέχει τὴν Ναζαρὲτ), that is, half way between Samaria and Galilee.[595] Because he was born in Nazareth everyone expected him to pass through the town; since he did not, it was expected that he give an explanation for not stopping over. His explanation was that no prophet maintains honor in his own town. Christ would have wasted his time giving teachings to them as they would neither honor nor accept his words.[596] He thus decided not to deviate from his original route because of his hometown.

Cyril's comment on Jn 4:44 was unique and many other interpreters, ancient and modern, have found difficulty in harmonizing the problem. Origen began by noting the inconsistency of the text and posed the question of what the statement about the honor of the prophet in his hometown has to do with his trip from Samaria to Galilee.[597] Origen contemplated further and wrote that whether Christ was in Samaria or in Galilee when he uttered this statement, neither was his hometown. Furthermore, the Evangelist was not perplexed or unclear about his language, for later he clearly expressed that he went into "Cana of

---

[593] *In Jo.* 1.403. Referring to Gen 1:10.

[594] Liddell Scott, 1050.

[595] *In Jo.* 1.300.

[596] Ibid.

[597] *Origène: Commentaire sur Saint Jean*, edited and translated by C. Blanc, SC vol. 222 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1975), 13.364.

Galilee."[598] Origen then focused on the issue of dishonored prophets and discussed some Old Testament examples and then concluded that Christ's statement was not only applicable to the prophets and to Christ, but was also applicable to every teacher throughout the ages. Not only Christian teachers, even Greek philosophers were persecuted.[599] Origen recognized the inconsistency, asked the right questions, and solved the issue by generalizing it to a universal issue that confronted and continues to face all teachers.

John Chrysostom also posed a similar question, concerning why the Evangelist added the statement about a prophet not having honor in his hometown. Chrysostom suggested that Christ said these words to avoid entering Capharnaum. Chrysostom further noted that Capharnaum is Christ's hometown based on Lk 10:15, *And you, Capharnaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades.*[600] It was known that Christ was from Nazareth and not from Capharnaum. Chrysostom failed to find a reason for the statement.[601] When comparing the suggested solutions by Origen, Chrysostom, and Cyril to solve the problem raised by Jn 4:44, Cyril's knowledge of geography gave him the upper hand in providing the most plausible interpretation.

Cyril's attention to the τέχνη of the grammarian and his appreciation of the historical aspect of the text, together with his special interest in geography, gave good results to Cyril's interpretation. The full implication of this exercise is apparent in his New Testament exegesis where its effect on interpretation and the spiritual meaning of the text is apparent.

Cyril and Greek culture

The aspects of Greek culture most significant in Cyril's work are the analogies he draws from Greek philosophers and poets, and his use of logical argumentation drawn from the rhetorical system. Reflection and use of analogies are the fifth element on the art (τέχνη) of grammatical analysis of a text according to Dionysius Thrax. Scholars' interest in Cyril is

---

[598] Ibid., 13.365–7.

[599] Ibid., 13.371–380.

[600] John Chrysostom, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Homily 35. PG 59.200 A,B.

[601] Let us consider Raymond Brown as an example of a modern scholar's opinion on this dilemma. Brown writes, "A better solution for the problem created by vs. 44 is to regard it as an addition by the redactor." R. A. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 1 (New Doubleday, 1966), 187. The redactor was Brown's solution.

primarily dogmatic with a great focus on post-Nestorian writings. Fewer studies have given attention to his exegetical work, all of which are Old Testament Studies.[602] Furthermore, hardly any philosophers paid attention to Cyril. Maybe the damaging testimonies of Harnack and Liebaert had dissuaded scholars of philosophy from having interest in Cyril. Wilken is of the opinion that

> "Cyril of Alexandria is one of the less attractive figures in the ancient Church. Many protestant historians, offended by his churchmanship and intimidated by his orthodoxy, have joined in the condemnation voiced by one of his contemporaries on hearing of Cyril's death …. Historians of theology have claimed that he had no theological interest, and was motivated solely by political ends. Once Harnack made the proud boast that he need not cite passages from Cyril, since Cyril's theology was quite simple and would be recognized immediately by anyone familiar with the subject. In his view Cyril was an Apollinarian. After commenting on Cyril's Christology, Harnack remarked, "This either means nothing at all or it is Appollinarianism." (*History of Dogma*, IV, 176.)[603]

Though Wilken's remarks explained the theological dismissal from which Cyril suffered, there are recent attempts to redeem Cyril from this condemnation. The previous type of assertions in combination with Liebaert's comment might have aggravated the situation even more. Liebaert concluded his article that investigated Cyril's interest in the ancient culture by writing, "dont les goûts et les qualités furent d'un bibliste et d'un théologien, non d'un lettré ni d'un philosophe."[604] Hopefully philosophical attention to Cyril will catch up with the theological and the slow-growing exegetical attention.

We will therefore begin our investigation into this matter with Cyril's opinion about Greek philosophy, his use of Greek citations, and conclude with a brief synopsis of scholarly assessment of the topic. Cyril's writings did not betray a great fascination with Greek culture. He uses few Greek analogies and references in his writings. This is an example of how Cyril perceives Greek culture and philosophy. He writes,

---

[602] Like that of Kerrigan, *St Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament*, and a couple of unpublished dissertations in the last decade, for example that of O'Keefe's work on Malachi, and Cassel's work on Isaiah. All three are dedicated to Old Testament texts.

[603] R. L. Wilken, "Exegesis and History," *Church History* 34 (1966), 141.

[604] J. Liébaert, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et la culture antique," Mélanges de Science Religieuse 12 (1955), 21.

> For the Greeks who seem to be wise, and filled with worldly and devilish wisdom, expend long and short discourses, and speak purposeless circular presentations, and as it is written, *weaving the spider's web*,[605] verily pretend to seek what is the nature of truth, goodness, or justice, and inventing to themselves only the shadow of true knowledge, without entirely tasting the virtue of accomplishing deeds, and remain being destitute of wisdom from above, and make their exercises of words without profit.
> Ἑλλήνων μὲν γὰρ οἱ δοκωοῦντες εἶναι συνετοὶ, καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς καὶ δαιμονιώδους σοφίας ἀναπεπλησμένοι, μακροὺς καὶ πικροὺς ἀναλίσκοντες λόγους, καὶ κύκλους θεωρημάτων εἰκαίων ἐλίττοντες, ἱστόν τε ἀράχνης κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ὑφαίνοντές τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἤτοι τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ἤ τὸ δίκαιον ὅ τι ποτὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν, προσποιοῦνται ζητεῖν, καὶ μόνην ὥσπερ σκιὰν τῆς ἀληθοῦς γνώσεως ἑαυτοῖς ἀναπλάττοντες, ἄγευστοι παντελῶς τῆς ἐν ἔργοις διατελοῦσιν ἀρετῆς, καὶ τῆς ἄνωθέν τε καὶ ὄντως σοφίας ἔρημοι διαμένοντες, ἐπ᾽ οὐδενὶ τῶν χρησίμων ἔσθ᾽ ὅτε τὰ μέχρι λόγων ποιοῦνται γυμνάσματα.[606]

Cyril seemed to have the following problems with Greek culture: the source of their wisdom was worldly and devilish, there was too much use of words without a set aim of reaching virtue or accomplishing deeds, and, in addition, the result of their endeavors was in vain. These were Cyril's words and should reflect his viewpoint, yet he was not the only one to have these opinions. He was rather representative of the worldview of his time—not only the religious milieu in which he was surrounded but also the secular.

There was hostility between rhetoric and philosophy. The leading figure in this debate was Plato. Schenkeveld summarizes the debate as follows,

> Plato's objections to contemporary rhetoric are that it is just a collection of recipes, not a well-ordered system; moreover, its practitioners do not try to educate their audience, are not interested in its psychology and only say what is pleasing to their listeners. Plato's main disapproval, therefore, turns on the lack of moral goals in rhetoric."[607]

This account of the debate between rhetoric and philosophy has a long history, beginning with Plato and Isocrates from about the fourth century BC, and later, in the first two centuries AD, we find the same arguments

---

[605] Is 59:5.

[606] *In Jo.* 1.594.

[607] Dirk Schenkeveld, "Philosophical Prose," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed., Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 198.

discussed by Quintilian.[608] Quintilian's writing was a synthesis of rhetorical works up to his time; thus this opinion was quite representative. Cyril's disdain for philosophy is noted in this historical debate between philosophy and rhetoric. He must have absorbed the ferocity of the debate from his teachers during his grammatical instruction. By the end of the fourth century AD there began attempts to reconcile philosophy and rhetoric. Isocrates had already tried to reconcile both disciplines and calls his "rhetoric φιλοσοφία and maintained that it is 'a wisdom in practical affairs resulting in high moral consciousness and equated with mastery of the rhetorical technique.'"[609] By the end of the debate rhetors incorporated in their system training in θέσεις[610] and this was part of the philosophical educational programs as suggested by Aristotle.[611]

We find the same concerns echoed by Cyril as well as secular circles. They both condemned the indulgence in rhetoric without aim, and this is what Cyril called "circular presentations." There was the common complaint of the lack of moral aim or benefit due to indulgence in the flurry of rhetoric. This is what Cyril called the "shadow of true knowledge" and their inability to taste true virtue which has its realization in good deeds.[612] If the seculars complained about the lack of "morals in rhetoric," Cyril, who believed that Scripture was the source of all moral ethics, certainly agreed with the secular Greek philosophers who complained of lack of morality. Cyril was taking advantage of the debate between philosophy and rhetoric and echoed the same concerns for the advantage of Christian education and rhetoric.

Liébaert noted that in Book Seven of *Contra Iulianum*, Cyril was asked about the value of Greek culture. He answered that scriptures contain the perfect information for the Spirit, and the "things outside," that is, outside the spiritual realm or non-Christian knowledge, are not necessary.

---

608 Ibid., 197.

609 Ibid., 198.

610 θέσεις is part of "invention." Invention (εὕρεσις) means "discovery," that is, the discovery of the resources that are present in a given rhetorical problem. For further reading on these two elements of classical rhetoric read Malcom Heath, "Invention," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89–119.

611 Ibid., 199.

612 Under the subtitle 'Cyril's education in the desert' in Chapter One, we discussed how Cyril's insistence on the practice of righteousness is essential if we want to attain the Divine Courts. Cyril held the principle that moral living must accompany faith.

Nonetheless, Cyril ended his argument on a more positive note, similar to that of Clement and Origen, and noted that we learn virtue from the Holy Spirit but we utilize Greek letters as a preparatory exercise to true teaching (οἷον τι προγύμνασμα τῆς ἀληθοῦς παιδείας).[613]

Cyril's education in Greek *paideia* exposed him to some Greek philosophy and literature. Cyril's knowledge of Greek philosophy was elucidated in the following passages in *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. In the story of the feeding of the five thousand, Cyril commented on Jn 6:5–7 that Christ takes care of those who depend on him. When the multitude, or in general all humanity, were in need of food they came to him and the mighty creator created food for them. Then Cyril compared the hope of the multitude on Christ as their remaining hope to what the Greek poets say, " ---- σιδήρεον ἕλκος ἀνάγκης."[614] In this case he was likely referring to the bodily pain of hunger.

Another reference is in Jn 6:38–9 that spoke about the will of the Father and the Son. Cyril, in the attempt to explain that the Trinity has one will, feared that his readers were not attentive to his words due to the difficulty of the subject matter. To grasp the attention of his readers, he referred to a Greek saying and compared his difficult words to words that do not go straight but are scattered out of the king's trodden way and having left the carriage road these words pressed forward on a steep hill and rocks (ὡς ὁ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν ἔχει λόγος, τὴν ἁμαξιτὸν, ἐπὶ κρημνοὺς ἐπείγῃ δαὶ πέτρας).[615]

Cyril devoted Chapter Four of Book Four to the discussion of the tabernacle. He explained that the tabernacle was built on the first month, at the beginning of spring. Then Cyril elaborated on the spring imagery and described the sun, the flowers, the plains of grass, and the cornfields. It seems that this description of nature was influenced by some Greek poet, to whom Cyril gave credit by saying that this description is "as one Greek poet says" (κατά τινας τῶν παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι ποιητῶν).[616]

When Christ attended the Festival of the Booths, he began teaching in the temple. The crowds were amazed at his teachings, but some of those attending the festival began questioning him and accused him of being possessed by a demon since he transgressed the Sabbath by healing a sick

---

[613] PG 76.852B–860. A. J. Liébaert, "Saint Cyrille D'Alexandrie et la culture antique," 18–9.

[614] *In Jo.* 1.409. Which can be translated as the iron wound of bodily pain, or the iron wound of necessity.

[615] *In Jo.* 1.489.

[616] *In Jo.* 1.567.

man and some in the crowds attempted to kill him. Christ confronted the crowds and said, *I performed one work, and all of you are astonished?* (Jn 7:21). Cyril commented on this verse by saying that Christ was very cautious in his approach with the crowds and did not confront them but soothed them by saying *I performed one work* knowing that the crowds themselves transgressed the Law on many occasions. At this point, Cyril turned his attention to the unruled crowds and justified his description by appealing to the phrase, "according to Greek poets" (κατὰ τοὺς παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι ποιητὰς),[617] and writes the following description,

> For according to Greek poets, the undecided council and multitudes are prone to anger and as they might pretend to please with smooth agreement, and are easily excited like a bold bull, and how they are apt to act with fierce might to bold ends.
> Ἀκριτόβουλον γάρ πως, κατὰ τοὺς παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι ποιητὰς, καὶ πρόχειρον εἰς ὀργὴν ἀεὶ τὸ πλῆθός ἐστι, καὶ λειοτάτῃ συμπνοίᾳ τῇ πρὸς ὅπερ ἄν βούλοιτο κεχρημένον, καὶ εἰς ἀκάθεκτον θράσος εὐκόλως ἀποταυρούμενον, γοργότερον δέ πως ἤπερ ἐχρῆν εἰς τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς δεινοῖς ἁλίσκεται τόλμας.[618]

The imagery is that of excited crowds attending a fight in an arena. It is quite interesting to find Cyril making the analogy of the crowds at the temple similar to those in an arena. He wanted very much to convey to his readers the ferocity of the confrontation between the crowds at the temple and Christ.

In the pericope of the blind man whom Christ healed, the Pharisees called the blind man for questioning and they tried to convey the message that they, the Pharisees, did not know from where the one who healed him came. In defense of Christ who healed him, the blind man answers, *if this man were not from God, he could do nothing* (Jn 9:33). Cyril explained that the blind man was much quicker to perceive the truth than the Pharisees who were supposed to be instructed by the Law. The blind man defended Christ by saying that no one is able to do miracles unless he comes from God, for miracles are only done through divine work or operation (ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ διὰ μόνων ἁγίων τὰ τοιαῦτα Θεός).[619] For God only bestowed on the saints such capabilities. If this was not the case, then what is the difference between the good and the bad, between the just and the sinner, for if both could perform miracles and there is no distinction then this would create confusion.

---

[617] *In Jo.* 1.611.
[618] *In Jo.* 1.611.
[619] *In Jo.* 2.194.

> "For it is as one Greek poet said,
> if the shirker is allotted the same share as the one who makes war,
> and the evil shares the same honor as the good, will it not be bitter to experience hardships on account of virtue?"
>
> εἰ γὰρ καθάπερ ἔφη τις τῶν παρ'Ἕλλησι ποιντῶν
> Ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι,[620]
> καὶ ἐν ἴσῃ τιμῇ κακός τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς, πῶς οὐκ εἰκαῖον τὸ πικρῶν ἀποπειρᾶσθαι πόνων διὰ τὴν ἀρετήν;[621]

Good and evil cannot share the same honor and reward, and the Iliad was the good place for Cyril to make the analogy.

All five of these references to Greek poets came as analogies. Cyril was using the references to validate the image in a more common way. None of these references was a source of moral exhortations, or an addition to a new understanding, or a deep philosophical speculation. They would be considered more as a style of writing where Cyril elaborated on a certain image with the aid of the available, well known, Greek imagery.

As to the presence of other Greek references in Cyril's literary corpus, most scholars who wrote on this topic, focused on *Contra Iulianum*. The reason was that *Contra Iulianum* contains abundant references to Greek writers and this presented a good source of data in comparison to the rest of Cyril's literary corpus. *Contra Iulianum* has seventy references[622] to Greek literature in comparison to the *Commentary on John's* five references. Cyril cited Plato, Aristotle, and Porphyry among others.[623] Liébaert provided a more comprehensive list of Greek writers that Cyril cited beyond those that Julian mentions.[624] This list shows that Cyril quoted mostly from Hermes Trismegistus, Homer, Plato, Plotinus, and Porphyry. It is interesting to note that Aristotle is not mentioned in the list from the *Thesaurus* though we know that Cyril was extremely well aquainted with Aristotle.[625]

---

[620] Liddell Scott's identified this Homeric verse to be from Iliad 9.318. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press), 1103.

[621] *In Jo.* 2.194.

[622] Du Manoir, *Dogme et Spiritualité*, 448.

[623] Du Manoir makes a list of the major writers that Cyril referred to in Ibid., 449.

[624] J. Liébaert, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et la culture antique," 22–26.

[625] J. M. Labelle, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie, témoin de la langue et de la pensée philosophiques au Ve siècle," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 52(1978): 148.

The use of Greek culture and philosophy was not only limited to citations; rather it was incorporated within the rhetorical system and the logic of argumentation from the very beginning. The struggle among the rhetorical and the philosophical schools led to an incorporation of both disciplines on many facets. The early Christian writers felt some dependence on Greek rhetoric and ultimately Greek philosophy for rules of argument. From the earliest years Christian writers not only adapted some of the Greek and pagan wisdom into Christianity, but even justified its use and defended it. The beginning of such a process can be traced to Clement of Alexandria. Clement, and those who followed him, attempted to argue that the basis of Greek philosophy and thus philosophical argumentation had its roots in the Mosaic Law.[626] Further research is needed to understand this aspect of Cyril's work and assess the impact of Greek philosophical thinking on his theological argumentation.[627]

---

[626] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 5. For a synthesis of the early Christian attempts to defend the use of Greek philosophers since Greek wisdom is derived from the Old Testament refer to Winrich Lohr, "The Theft of the Greeks," *Revue d'histoire Ecclésiastique* 95.3 (2000): 403–426.

[627] The most important work in that field is by Ruth Siddals, "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1984) together with a summary article of the dissertation "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria," *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1987): 341–67. Siddals reached the conclusion that "this mind [of Cyril] has been educated to think in a particular way, and shares with the Neo-Platonists of Late Antiquity a genuine fascination for Aristotle's *Organon* and Porphyry's *Isagoge*." Ibid., 341. She also concluded that she showed "the degree of precision which Cyril brings to christology, by using tools of elementary logic. Having acquired a grasp of Aristotelian and Porphyrian logic early in his career, Cyril used this facility in developing his primary christological model, his pattern of exegesis, and his soteriology. The presence and value of these conceptual tools needs to be recognized in any evaluation of Cyril's theology and, indeed, in any assessment of the Nestorian controversy." Ibid., 366–7. On the other hand, Labelle suggested that Aristotle had great influence on Cyril through Cyril's constant use and reading of Porphyry. J. M. Labelle, "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie: témoin de la langue et de la pensée philosophiques au Ve siécle," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 52 (1979): 34. Boulois wrote that Cyril interpreted Plato through Numenius, Porphyry, and Plotinus. Marie-Odile Boulois, "Platon entre Moise et Arius selon le *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997): 267. Boulois' statement was very close to Labelle's argument that the readings of Porphyry influenced Cyril and introduced him to other philosophers. Kearsley quoted Meijering who affirms that Cyril "tells us himself, for example, that he discerns a Christian view of God not only in some of Plato, but also in Plotinus (AD 205–270), the founder of Neoplatonist philosophy, and in his disciple

Other than Cyril's dependence on earlier Christian writers, Greek culture, and philosophy, he also read Josephus. Cyril explained that Christ prophesied the suffering of the Jews when he said to the weeping women, *Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children* Lk 23: 28. On another occasion he said to them, *when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near* Lk 21:20. Cyril commented that the Jews suffered wars and were removed from their country and many other things that Josephus related in his history (ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἰώσηπος ἐν οἰκείοις συγγράμμασι).[628]

Style

Style is the third element in the five parts of speech (μέρη λόγου) in Greek rhetoric.[629] Style is very important because it has a direct impact on listeners, and in our case readers, since it includes choice of words and

---

Porphyry." Roy Kearsley, "The Impact of Greek Concepts of God on the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria," *Tyndale Bulletin* 43 (1992): 309. Kearsley wanted to prove the effect of Neoplatonism on Cyril and that Cyril's attempts were not to "replicate" Neoplatonism but rather to "transpose" it. Ibid., 307. Andersen, after assessing previous scholarship regarding the impact of Platonism on Christian Christology, proposed that the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria and the Christian theologians formed some sort of an alliance in Alexandria since both were threatened by the Manichaean dualism. G. Andersen, "The Integration of Platonism into Early Christian Theology," *Studia Patristica* 15 (1975): 399–414. Liébaert wrote that Cyril's polemics against Arius led Cyril to use, sometimes, the principles of logic and definitions borrowed from Aristotelian dialectic. Liébaert, "Saint Cyril d'Alexandrie et la culture antique," 19. Grant's and Datema's articles are important for listings of Cyril's use of Greek philosophers in works beyond *Contra Iulianum* and *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*. For further reading about the influence of ancient Egyptian religion on Cyril's writing, read, J. McGuckin, "The Influence of the Isis Cult on St. Cyril of Alexandria's Christology," *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 291–299. Etienne Drioton, "Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'ancienne religion Égyptienne," in *Kyrilliana: Études variées à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*, (Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Égyptien, 1947), 231–246. Also Laszlo Kakosy, "A Christian Interpretation of the Sun Disk," in *Studies in Egyptian Religion*, ed. M. Van Voss, 72–76 (Leiden: Brill, 1982).

628 *In Jo.* 2.32. According to Cassel, Cyril also referred to Josephus when describing the captivity of the Jews in Is 5:13. Cassel, *Cyril as Grammarian*, 187.

629 Wuellner, *Arrangement*, 50–83 also discusses the various divisions of the "parts of speech" following the different schools of rhetoric.

clarity of presentation and thus has a lasting persuasive impact.[630] There are four main "virtues" of style: correctness or purity, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety.[631] Thus style is an integral part of the rhetorical tool that Cyril is employing in his exegetical method.

Cyril wrote in Attic Greek.[632] According to the four virtues of style, Cyril preserved the correctness or purity of the language. The one thing that all scholars who worked on Cyril agreed upon was the complexity of Cyril's literary style. Complexity might affect the second virtue of style "clarity." Cyril was quite determined to be clear and this was expressed in his repetitive style. Cyril did not pay great attention to clarity—defined as simple presentation—depending on the fact that his commentary was not an oral presentation and his audience was not listeners, but readers who were keen to delve into the biblical interpretation.

Wilken described his language as "not easy."[633] He added the following comment with regards to *Contra Iulianum*, which can be taken as representative of Cyril's writing style more generally.

> Cyril's style is prolix and turgid, an unhappy synergy of grandiloquence and affectation; he likes rare and unusual words (he is particularly fond of compound verbs); and he is achingly repetitious. He even has the habit of repeating little words at the beginning of a sentence: Οὕτω γὰρ οὕτω,῎Εδει ... ἔδει,῎Αθρει ... ἄθρει. The *Contra Iulianum* is not a book one reads for pleasure.[634]

Cyril's use of "rare and unusual words" was well noted during the compilation of a *Lexicon of Patristic Greek* in which Cross writes,

---

[630] Galen O. Rowe, "Style," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 121.

[631] Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 1.4–7. Deals with some aspects of grammar as part of style such as correctness, use of language, and orthography.

[632] Liébaert commented on Cyril's *Thesaurus* that it was written in Attic Greek. Liébaert was of the opinion that Cyril, more than any other Father, is distinguished for his Attic Greek, pure syntax and rich vocabulary. Liébaert, *Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et la culture antique*, 20.

[633] Robert Wilken, "Cyril of Alexandria's Contra Iulianum," in *The Limits of Ancient Christianity*, ed. W. Klingshrin (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 43.

[634] Ibid. Altaner said, "Cyril's writings, which are very important for Church history and the history of dogma, do not rank very high as literary productions." As quoted in Burghardt, *Image of God in Man*, 51. And Burghardt adds, "Especially in exegesis, his style is as prolix as his output is prolific." Ibid.

> The material in our files has disclosed that Cyril coined a highly distinctive vocabulary. There are well over 1,000 words which occur either in Cyril alone or in Cyril for the first time or in Cyril more frequently than in the whole of Greek literature taken together. These Cyrilline words are compounds of common words or verbal elements with prepositional prefixes. Characteristic instances are ἀναφοιτάω, γραοπρεπής, κατωθέω, προαναθρέω. Especially frequent are compounds with κατά and σύν, in each case numbering between 100 and 150. These words are so characteristic that their occurrence is a sure test of Cyrilline authorship.[635]

It seems that Cyril himself worked hard to maintain a distinguished and precise vocabulary. For we know of a surviving text by the title *Spelling Book* (περί ὀρθογραφία) of John Thrax to which he added several additions of uncommon words. Most scholars identified that book as belonging to Cyril of Alexandria since the name Cyril was inscribed on the text.[636] Therefore, neologism is considered one of the main characteristics of Cyril's style.

The distinguished and rich word style of Cyril causes us to infer that he is a precise writer and if no word existed that would express the exact meaning that he wanted to convey to his readers, he resorted to coining new words. We can suggest that he was aiming to create a Christian vocabulary that was distinct from the secular or pagan usage to liberate Christianity from the Greek philosophical terminology. He wanted to rid the words from the loaded nuances of their pagan usage. Of course, the Greek language was imbedded in its culture, and freedom of nuances can be beyond one generation's task. Most probably he wanted to initiate the process that would free Greek words of their Greek pagan past and recreate a new Greek-Christian vocabulary. Based on this general observation of the richness and precision of Cyril's vocabulary, it is time to reassess the general scholarly view that Cyril was an imprecise theologian because he used, according to their conjecture, the term φύσις and ὑπόστασις interchangeably. It is hard to accept that the writer who took pain to coin new words in the language or seek words that were hardly in use to convey the precise meaning was careless or unaware of the different use of the terms φύσις and ὑπόστασις.

---

635 F. L. Cross, "The Projected Lexicon of Patristic Greek," in Actes du VIe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines (Paris, 1950): 392.

636 Robert Browning, *Education in the Roman Empire*, 858.

McGuckin commented that Cyril came in an era of defining theological dogmas for the Church. He is of the opinion that scholarship on literary work of such a great Church theologian demanded the following:

> "an acute reworking, his doctrine is both technical and philosophically demanding. One of his most important contributions to Christian history is the way in which he worked out an exact terminological scheme of discourse. It would be a mistake, however, to think that this makes Cyril a dull writer. There are passages where, like many other ancient rhetors, his capacity for elaborating an argument through several variations sometimes exceeds the patience of modern readers, but throughout all his work there is a spirit of passion and religious fervor that communicates itself to those who have the eyes to see and the ears to hear, and the Dialogue presented here represents Cyril in the full flight of his theological maturity, yet in a literary style that is at once fluent and elegant."[637]

McGuckin's observation on the "Dialogue" was relevant to Cyril's style in general and to the Johannine commentary under discussion. Precision and repetitiveness were certainly characteristic of Cyril's work. As mentioned above, he was so repetitive at the beginning of the Commentary, that he explained all the major theological themes to the extent that, by the end of the Commentary, Cyril was largely narrating the biblical text.

Cyril's repetitiveness was considered by modern standards boring. However, he considered it the duty of a good teacher not to be slothful.

> Do you see the offspring of teaching yielding much fruit? Do you see the great profit found in repetition? Accordingly, let those who are entrusted to teach to learn of this, let it be seen that he is above all fear, think that silence brings complete loss to himself than to his listeners, and not to countermine the master's talent in the earth in idle sloth, but rather give his money to the bankers.
>
> Ὁρᾷς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ γείτονα τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀναδοθέντα καρπόν; ὁρᾷς ὅσον τῆς ἐπαναλήψεως εὑρέθη τὸ κέρδος; μανθανέτω τοιγαροῦν διὰ τούτων ὁ διδάσκειν πεπιστευμένος, ὅκνου μὲν ἀμείνων ὁρᾶσθαι παντὸς, ἑαυτῷ δὲ πλέον ἢπερ τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις ἐπιζήμιον ἡγεῖσθαι τὴν σιωπὴν καὶ μὴ εἰς ἀργίαν μὲν ἀδρανῆ, καθάπερ εἰς γῆν, τὸ δεσποτικὸν ἀντορύττειν τάλαντον, διανέμειν δὲ μᾶλλον τοῖς τραπεζίταις τὸ ἀργύριον·[638]

---

[637] John McGuckin, "A Synopsis of St. Cyril's Christological Doctrine," *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998): 42.

[638] *In Jo.* 1.192.

Cyril was driven by a sense of responsibility of a teacher who was entrusted with the faith and must defend it. He realized that he was entrusted by God with a talent, that was his ability to be a good teacher (being in the position of teacher-reader) and was obligated to expound the faith to his greatest ability. He considered any endeavor, less than his maximum, as sloth. He repeated the same sentiment more than once. For example he says, "we have many times said and say again, for through discussion you receive great benefit."[639] And again he reiterated the same thing when he wrote that Christ goes over the same words again when he finds that his listeners did not understand him the first time. For this is something most befitting to teachers (διδασκάλοις) to repeat the instruction many times so that it may be fixed within the souls of the hearers.[640] Cyril was aware of his repetitive style, and defended it on the basis that it was part of the necessity of teaching. Even Christ, the great teacher, did the same thing.

Dratesellas was of the opinion that "when Cyril ponders on the Incarnation of the Word of God and man's salvation, which was the eternal will of God the Father, he uses the active tense in the verbs when the subject is God the Father (πέπομφεν τὸν' Ιδιον Υἱὸν), and that he uses the verb in its passive tense when God the Word is the subject and God the Father is the cause (ἀπεστάλη μετὰ σαρκός)."[641] Though this is a very insightful comment, further investigation on the Cyrillian literary corpus is needed before asserting the generality of such a literary observation.

Cyril's literary style was characterized by its complexity, neologism, richness of vocabulary, the use of compound words with prepositional prefixes, repetition, precision, attention to detail, and instruction. Ornamentation, the third virtue of style, did not leave any significant trace on Cyril's style.

Argumentation with Heretics

The aim of this commentary is to refute heretical teaching. Therefore, it is suitable to provide a quick note on Cyril's method of argumentation against heretics. Scholars of rhetoric conventionally divided speech into three

---

[639] *In Jo.* 2.88.

[640] *In Jo.* 2.103.

[641] C. Dratsellas, *Questions of the Soteriological teaching of the Greek Fathers with special reference to St. Cyril of Alexandria* (Athens, 1967–8), 203; quoted in Lars Koen, *The Saving Passion*. Studia Doctrinae Christianae Upsaliensia, 31 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1991), 70.

kinds: deliberative, forensic, and epideictic.[642] The forensic or judicial speech (δικανικόν) is usually delivered in court.[643] It became the most important and common kind of speech to be taught in schools since it prepared students in a practical way for their future livelihood, if they chose to have a legislative career. Most school exercises are based on forensic speeches, since students who were not even interested in law found this faculty valuable in order to manage their daily affairs. Thus, most of the handbooks written for teaching rhetoric focused primarily on judicial exercises at the expense of the other two genres.[644] Thus Cyril's education has equipped him with a mastery of forensic speech; and he artfully used it in his argumentation with heretics.

A common practice with Cyril, together with other early Christian writers, was to use the literary genre of dialogue in his refutation against heretics. It was mostly used by apologists in works of anti-Jewish polemics, a good example of this genre would be Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*. Cyril used, in Chapter One Book Four, this genre in his refutation of Eunomius.[645] Cyril also used this literary genre in his Nestorian controversy. The best example of which would be *Quod Unus sit Christus* and in his *De Trinitate Dialogi VII*. It was a literary genre that was quite favorable for Cyril's polemics and he used it throughout his literary career, before and after Nestorius. Since it was a literary genre unto itself and Cyril used this genre in some of his complete works, it is sufficient to simply make reference here since further investigation of this genre is beyond this research.[646] The other method of refuting heretics is the use of forensic speech and this is what we will begin presenting now.

---

[642] Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 1.8–9. Quintilian's description is restricted to deliberative and forensic oratory only.

[643] George Kennedy, "The Genres of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997),44. R. D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 12.

[644] Kennedy argues, based on speeches of historians, that deliberative oratory was influenced by "the rules of judicial speeches." George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), 204.

[645] One of his earliest compositions *De Adoratione et Cultu in Spiritu et Veritate* was written in the form of a dialogue between Cyril and a certain Pelladius.

[646] For more information about the literary genre of dialogue read "Le genre littéraire du dialogue dans les premiers siècles" and "Le problème des sources des Dialogues" in Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique*, 69–71. Liébaert was of the opinion that Cyril's sources in his dialogue are primarily Alexandrian. Ibid., 71.

In Book One Chapter Eight in his exposition of Jn 1:9 *The true light*, Cyril himself set the heading (κεφαλή) as, "thoughts or syllogisms" (ἔννοιαι ἤτοι συλλογισμοὶ).[647] This heading included fourteen arguments each introduced with ἄλλο and one with ἄλλο ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ.[648] The fourteen syllogisms indicated the importance of deductive logic in Cyril's argumentation. The logic included the introduction of Biblical verses as part of the premises on which the deductive argument takes place. This was followed by another thirteen arguments each introduced with ἄλλο.[649] The heading of these arguments indicated that it was another type of argumentation for those of "simpler thoughts" (ἁπλουστέρων ἐννοιῶν) in which he uses solely Biblical citations to demonstrate that the Son of God alone is the true Light.[650] Therefore, when Cyril set on the task of proving that the Son is the true Light he approached the topic from two sides, the logical side and the Biblical side. Moreover, within each mode of proof, he set various proofs, thirteen or fourteen of them with the aim of exhausting all possible aspects of the topic. This is also another good example of a teacher writer who was not too lazy to write all possible arguments for a single point.

The previous example was addressed to those of "simple thoughts" and targeted against Arius asserting that if the Son is true Light, and God is Light then the Son is true God. The following argument was towards those with "complex" thoughts and was targeted against Origen.[651] Cyril took the opportunity of Jn 1:9, *The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world* to delve into the argument. He began his argument to examine who are the beings capable to *enlighten everyone*. He began with the angels and went through the stories of Cornelius, Manoah—the father of Sampson—Zechariah, and Daniel as figures represented in the Old Testament to reach the conclusion that angels can enlighten people, and man can borrow illumination (φωτισμόν) from man.[652] This is because man is complex or compound (συνθίσει).[653] He explained that a wise man can give advice to a

[647] *In Jo.* 1.97.
[648] *In Jo.* 1.97–102.
[649] *In Jo.* 1.103–7.
[650] *In Jo.* 1.103.
[651] Cyril attempted to refute Origen in *Ep.* 81 that is addressed to the "holy fathers at Scitis." His refutation in this epistle was primarily focused on those who do not believe in the resurrection of the body. *ACO* 3.201–2. The refutation in the Johannine commentary is more lengthy and comprehensive.
[652] *In Jo.* 1.108–9.
[653] *In Jo.* 1.109.

friend. He who gives wisdom to others, if he be originate, is not wisdom itself, but a minister of the wisdom that is in him, for in wisdom is a wise man.[654] So is the case with the one who teaches prudence, or enlightens others, or communicates any good that he received. Everything in us is a gift of God, for God has given the Apostles and instructed them *you received without payment; give without payment* (Mt 10.8). Originate things (τὰ γενητὰ) are compound (συνθέσει), then light is consequently compound, that is, compound with what they receive from God. The *true Light* is that which lightens, not that which is lighted by another, and this is the Only-Begotten. The Son is simple and not a compound nature, for the Godhead takes nothing from a double (διπλόης).[655] When a person enlightens another, it is done by teaching. When God enlightens us, this is not done by teaching, as angels and men do, but rather it is done at the moment of creation. God imparts in us wisdom straightway, as he has done with Adam. We receive God's light by his mercy.[656]

Cyril then explained the meaning of *the true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world.* It does not mean that the light passes physically from one location to another to enlighten the world. The Spirit said that the Light was in the world, therefore, it means the nature of man was lightened from the first periods and received understanding from the light that is in the world, and that it is the Son who fills all things with light. When Christ himself says, *I have come as light into the world* (Jn 12:46), he means he came into the world by the Incarnation.[657]

Cyril was careful to announce that coming to the world meant the Incarnation, for according to his argument, based on this verse, some—it is clear that he is referring to Origen—wrote, that the souls of men were preexistent. Being in the light, meant that the souls were in true bliss, but when they were overcome with strange thoughts and desires, God punished them and burdened them with bodies, and that by this trial the souls would try to do what is good.[658]

---

[654] Ibid.

[655] *In Jo.* 1.110.

[656] *In Jo.* 1.11–2.

[657] *In Jo.* 1.112–4.

[658] *In Jo.*1.115. It is interesting to note that Cyril proved that he was a close reader of Origen and he knew exactly the problematic issues in his theology. This is to be contrasted to Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien's comment in Cyril's vitae that he never read heretical teachers, especially Origen. It is clear that it is a rhetorical statement to express the piety and purity of Cyril's theological understanding. Evetts, *History of the Patriarchs*, 429. Actually, he did not only study

Cyril took this as an opportunity to launch a detailed criticism of the pre-existence of souls. He introduced his points of contention as to the absurdity of believing in the pre-existence of souls, and that sin is punished by sending the soul into bodies of earth (τὰ ἐκ γῆς καταπέμπεσθαι σώματα).[659] He set the following heading (κεφαλή), "thoughts or principles of an entangled and inferential character" (Ἔννοιναι ἤτοι θεωρήματα συμπεπλεγμένου καὶ σχήματος συλλογιστικοῦ).[660] He listed twenty-four arguments each forwarded with ἄλλο, and half of them were conditional sentences beginning with εἰ. The first eight were logical arguments, the rest were based on biblical arguments. The first eight pose these statements or questions:

1. If the Evangelist says the man is lightened (φωτίζεσθαί) when coming into the world, then this is considered as an honor and addition of gifts and not a punishment to chastise previous sins.661
2. If the soul is a pure mind (νοῦς ... καθαρὸς) why would it need to be lighted when the soul comes into the world?
3. If the soul that existed before the body and inclined to virtue sinned and was in bondage of the ills of the body; how then is it that when it was in this condition of bondage it received light?[662]
4. What is the reason for sending the soul that sinned into a body to learn by experiencing the disgrace of its own lust? To throw the soul in lust is not a way to heal but rather this would drag the soul into more sin.[663]
5. If the preexistent soul was entangled with flesh and blood (συνεπλάκη σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι)[664] for its sins, how is it that when it received remission of sin from Christ it still bears the method of its punishment. For those who believe in Christ believe in the resurrection of the body.[665]
6. If being entangled with flesh is the result of sin, why then is the one who commits the greatest offense by the Law, is by that same law honored with death and the one who has committed no crime suffers to live? Therefore, embodiment (ἐνσωμάτωσις) is not punishment.[666]

Origen closely, but rather all heretical teachings in order to write his dogmatic exegesis.

[659] *In Jo.* 1.116.

[660] *In Jo.* 1.117.

[661] *In Jo.* 1.117.

[662] Ibid.

[663] *In Jo.* 1.118.

[664] συνεπλάκη is an example of Cyril's newly coined words with a συν prefix.

[665] *In Jo.* 1.118–9.

[666] *In Jo.* 1.119.

7. If embodiment (ἐσαρκώθησαν) is a punishment, how did the Savior profit us by abolishing death? Why did he not destroy that which punishes us?[667]

8. Another form of the same principle: If bodies are a punishment, why do we thank God for promising the resurrection?

At this point Cyril has finished one set of arguments and follows it with another set of biblical arguments. He continues as follows:

9. Why does Isaiah the prophet rejoice at the resurrection of the dead, *the dead shall rise and they that are in the tombs shall be raised* (Is 26:19 LXX) when he should have proclaimed it with sorrow if it is a sign of punishment?[668]

10. God promised Abraham that his seed would be a multitude of stars. How could this be a blessing when all the souls of Abraham's seed are condemned souls?[669]

11. In Deut 1:10–11, how could God bless Israel to be a multitude of stars when it is a punishment.

12. God answered the prayer of Hanna with a child, did she then ask for the downfall of a soul?[670]

13. If the body is a punishment, why did Hezekiah, the king of Jerusalem, ask, with great supplication, for the increase of his years and not the death of his body?[671]

14. If embodiment is a punishment, why did the Eunuch bring up Jeremiah from the dungeon? Would it not have been a better honor to release him from his punishment? What was the reward to save the three youth and rescue Daniel from the lions?[672]

Having cited all possible examples of prominent figures in the Old Testament, he proceeded with verses from both the Old and the New Testament.

15. *For all of us must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil* (2 Cor 5:10). Man receives punishment or reward based on what he did in the body. There is not mention of prior sins. Therefore, there is not

---

667 Ibid.
668 *In Jo.* 1.120.
669 Ibid.
670 *In Jo.* 1.121.
671 *In Jo.* 1.121–2.
672 *In Jo.* 1.122.

preexistence of souls since only what is done during its time in the flesh is marked out.[673]

16. *Present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God* (Rm 12:1). If our bodies are given as a punishment to our souls, how can we present them as a sweet odor to God?

17. *Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam* (Rm 5:14). How does he say that death reigned over those who did not sin if the mortal body is given in consequence of former sin?[674]

18. *Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?* (Jn 9:2). Based on scripture that wrote, *punishing children for the iniquity of parents* (Ex 20:5). Christ answers neither him nor his parents. It is clear the discourse pertains to the period before his birth and Christ answers neither has sinned.[675]

19. God created the earth and *he formed it to be inhabited* (Is 45:18). The earth was not created to be filled with bare spirits but with bodies suitable to it. It is absurd to think that God creates souls that should sin in order to make the nature of bodies come into being.

20. *I was by him suiting myself to him, I was that wherein he took delight; and daily I rejoiced in his presence continually. For he rejoiced when he had completed the world and rejoiced among the children of men* (Prov. 8:30–1 LXX). When God completed the world he rejoiced in the forming of man. If souls were embodied as punishment then God is a maker of a prison rather than a world. How could God delight in punishment?[676]

21. If the flood was brought *on a world of the ungodly* (2 Pet 2:5). Noah who was righteous was rewarded by being preserved. Should not those who sinned linger more in the body, since it is a punishment? But we saw that it was the sinners who received release from their bodies. Therefore, bodies are not punishment for the souls of men or God would be unrighteous punishing the ungodly with favor and honoring the righteous with punishment.[677]

22. If the body is a punishment how did the Savior *love* Lazarus and raise him from the dead putting him in prison again (Jn 11:36).[678]

---

673 *In Jo.* 1.122–3.
674 *In Jo.*1.123.
675 *In Jo.* 1.123–4.
676 *In Jo.* 1.124.
677 *In Jo.* 1.125.
678 Ibid.

23. If bodies were punishment for sin, how then do we see that *death entered by sin?* (Rm 5:12).[679]

24. God created all things in incorruption and *He made not death*, but *through the envy of the devil came death into the world* (Wisdom 1:13; 2:24). If the body is punishment why accuse the *envy of the devil* for bringing in to us the termination of wretchedness. Why do we thank the Savior for the resurrection?[680]

Therefore, Cyril finally concludes, the body is not a mode of punishment nor is it the wages of our former sin.

The argument just described follows the model of forensic speech. The text began with commentary style by stating the verse to be interpreted and within it is enclosed complete forensic speech. The introduction (προοίμιον) introduced the verse under discussion, *which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world.*[681] Cyril realized that in the introduction he must discuss two points, who enlightens (the first part of the verse) and what it means to come into the world (the second part of the verse). Those who are capable of enlightening are three: angels, humans, and God. Angels and humans derive their enlightenment from God, the power to enlighten is not within them; therefore, they are compound beings. God, the Son, enlightens us from his own self, for he is the true Light; therefore he is simple, therefore he is divine and equal to God and true God. He thus established the first part of the verse.

The second half discussed what it means to come into the world. This is another way of speaking about the Incarnation. This was the beginning of the second part of the speech διήγησις and it was divided into proposition and reason or rationale.[682] The proposition is the Incarnation of the true light, or in other words it is the issue of the incarnation. The rationale stems from those who believe, based on this verse, in the incarnation of preexistent souls that dwelt in blissful light. They claim that the souls that transgressed were punished by being entangled in a body. Here, Cyril stated

---

[679] *In Jo.* 1.123–4.

[680] *In Jo.* 1.126.

[681] The introduction (προοίμιον) is common among all kinds of speech.

[682] The narration (διήγησις) includes "a clear statement of the proposition and the reason for its proposal." Rhetorical syllogism and reason (rationale) could be part of the proposition. Moreover, the propositions could include a host of things such as "maxims, proverbs, chreiai (anecdotes), citations, as well as stock themes or issues from popular ethical philosophy." Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 42. The "proposition" is where Christian writers differed from their pagan counterparts.

the στάσις or issue of his argument which is a major component in forensic speech.

The third part of forensic speech was proof (πίστις).[683] He provided twenty-four arguments divided into two main categories. The first category was the "invented" proof. This was done by the first group of eight arguments based on syllogism and rationale.[684] He presented a logical proof of the invalidity of being in bodies as a punishment. The second category was the "uninvented" proof. In this case, Cyril used witness and literary authority. Witnesses were usually chosen as persons of credible characters. His witnesses were the biblical characters, Isaiah, Abraham, Hannah, Hezekiah, and Jeremiah. From arguments fifteen to twenty-four he cites his literary authority. His literary authority was the bible, specifically Pauline epistles, prophetic citations, and wisdom literature.[685]

---

[683] Proof (πίστις) included opposite, analogy, example, citation of authority, and moral impression. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 5. (Quintilian devoted the whole of book five to "proof.") The opposite was primarily used in judicial oration where the opposing views were refuted. Analogy and example are the main forms that included the data or any other form of proof for the construction of the rhetorical argument. A further component of "proof" was citations. In judicial speech this was "some form of witness, precedent legal decision, or documentary evidence." Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 43. Also Kennedy, *Greek*, 10.

[684] Liébaert described Cyril's methods of addressing heresy as a collection of brief syllogisms of the same type. The thesis to be refuted or proved, was a conditional preposition, showing the reason, the case, the truth or absurdity of consequences. Lièbaert argued that syllogism is a method of Aristotelian argumentation. Liébaert thought that Cyril used it to fight the heretics on their grounds since Accacius and Eunomius also used it. On the other hand, Athanasius and Epiphanius were more dialectic in their arguments. Neither Gregory of Nyssa nor Basil applied syllogisms in their works in refuting Eunomius. It is to be noted that Didymus the Blind used syllogisms one after the other while Cyril separated his arguments by ἄλλό. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 57–8.

[685] In Liébaert's detailed comparative study between Cyril's *Thesaurus* and Athanasius' *Contra Arianus* he showed the dependence of Cyril on Athanasius with regard to the content of the argument. But a closer investigation is needed to know to what extent he was dependent upon Athanaius's literary style. It is observed that in Athanasius's text he set his problem followed by a reason for refutation. Then in *Contra Arianus* 1.11 he began his arguments by explaining texts beginning with Phil 2:9,10, followed by Ps 47:7,8 (*Contra Arianus* 1.12), then Heb 1:4 (*Contra Arianus* 1.13) where the latter was the final chapter of the First Discourse. The Second Discourse and Third Discourse were totally dedicated to the explanation of texts, both from the Old and the New Testament, with an emphasis on the Old. Athanasius devoted much attention to the backing of the biblical texts in his

The fourth part of forensic speech was the conclusion (ἐπίλογος). The body is not a mode of punishment.

Cyril presented a forensic speech of perfect "argument." It is a treatise in defense of the orthodox doctrine against Origen, though his name is never explicitly mentioned.[686]

The composition of this treatise followed the rhetorical rules to the greatest extent. Though the method of writing followed rhetorical rules to the letter, we should be aware of the extraordinary Christianization of rhetoric that took place in this very same treatise.[687] The thesis and proposition were concerned with Christian topics that pertain to the faith and Christian dogma. The defense and proof, were heavily Christianized. The credible witness was not the senator, the gods, or notable warriors but was comprised of no other than the biblical characters that constitute the greatest witness to the Christian message. Citations of authority were not from Homer, nor poetry, nor any famous philosopher. The citations were Biblical citations, whose moral credibility is unquestionable. Homer was no longer the source from which to derive moral axioms.

Conclusion

To interpret the exegetical method of any writer, one has to examine the literary and spiritual aspects of his method. In the early church, the literary aspect was dependent upon the way writers wrote and addressed their audience. This means, it was dependent on the educational system that produced these writers, it was dependent on the art of writing, the art of persuasion, and it was dependent on rhetoric. Though all rhetorical methods explained in the early textbooks were in connection to the art of speech and persuasion, what was written complied with these methods, either because they were first written and then memorized for delivery, or

---

arguments. The biblical text also served as a witness and a source of authority to Athanasius. Therefore, Cyril was not only following a grammatical tradition of refutation, he was also following a line of Alexandrian theological tradition of polemics.

[686] Liébaert noted that Cyril frequently uses the terms οἱ αἱρετικοί, οἱ δι᾽ ἐναντίας, etc.; when referring to heretics in the cases when their names were not explicitly mentioned. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 74.

[687] For another perspective on the christianization of rhetoric read Andreas Sprira, "The Impact of Christianity on Ancient Rhetoric," *Studia Patristica* 18.2 (1989): 137–53 where he considered Christianity as the source of new "fire" in rhetoric after the decline of the republic and the rise of the monarchy when rhetoric lost the "life force."

because the audience was so tuned to the oratory style, that it consequently affected the written literature and became the standard means of communication.

Cyril of Alexandria was neither an orator nor a poet, and thus did not attract as much attention by scholars of rhetoric as other famous Christian writers, such as Augustine, the Cappadocians, or Chrysostom to mention just a few. Therefore, it is due time to take a closer look at this aspect of his work.

Knowing the basic elements of classical rhetoric we can suggest the following literary aspects in Cyril's writings with special attention to commentary writing based on that of John. Cyril followed the rules of commentary writing by first citing the verse under consideration and then ensued with a detailed commentary on it, word by word. He divided his commentary into twelve books. This division was partly based on the practical aspect of book production and thus took into consideration size and bookbinding and other publishing limitations of the time. Within these practical restrictions he accommodated his inner spiritual and theological division. For example, the prologue was most important for him to expand on the major dogmatic issues debated in his time, and therefore he dedicated a whole book for this pericope. Within these two main divisions, the verse division came into play. Verse division is part of the exegetical procedure where in some cases theology might affect the division as in the example of ὅ γέγονεν in Jn 1:3,4. Or as in the case of Jn 5:36–38 and Jn 6:27 where the division is consequential on the interpretation; or as in Jn 20:11–30 the division depends on the role of the character in the pericope.

The art or τέχνη of grammatical analysis included, after text division, grammar, and explaining historical aspects of the text. In Cyril's case the historical aspects emphasized grammar and geography. An important characteristic of Cyril's literal work was his attention to grammatical nuances as in the case of the definite article that ultimately had a defining role in his theological interpretation. In addition he had his astute remarks on punctuation, which is that part of grammar that affects verse division and interpretation, and his care about textual exactness.

An exceptionally noticeable aspect of his work was his attentiveness to geography. Though part of the grammarian's job is to explain historical or geographical aspects of any text, his interest was not just clarification about location, but an interest that affected interpreting Christ's travel behavior as in the case of Jn 4:43–45 and understanding where was the true hometown of Christ. This is where the Johannine commentary revealed this very distinguished aspect of Cyril's theological ability in comparison to Old

Testament commentaries where theological aspects might not be so decisive.

Cyril's use of Greek culture was sparse because he believed, as well as his secular contemporaries and Greek philosophers, that it was not a true source of wisdom, it was too indulgent in rhetoric without realizing a moral aim. Nevertheless, his condemnation of Greek culture did not involve a total ban on its use, but rather to be selective in using it, and employ it for the benefit of true teaching. He used Greek references in his work on the *Commentary on John* for the sake of analogy as a literary style but did not pretend to make any moral use or derive wisdom from these analogies. It was a means of clarifying his point to the readers with familiar imagery.

Cyril's literary style was so complex that it has affected scholars' interest in him. Adding to the complexity were lengthy arguments that seem repetitive to the modern reader, and his use of obscure words led him to be unwelcomed in scholarly circles. His books are difficult reading, and the lack of entertaining aspects in his works, together with choosing difficult dogmatic topics led to a meager output of scholarly work on the major part of his work. It was his obligation as a teacher that drove him to these lengthy and prolific set of works.

His argumentation with heretics was quite a good example of Cyril applying forensic rhetoric. He followed the four main parts of forensic composition, προοίμιον, διήγησις, πίστις, ἐπίλογος to the minutest detail. He was a writer who was very well trained in rhetoric and his literary production was an attestation to that. However, Cyril did not follow the rules of rhetoric without any understanding of himself as a Christian writer, and he Christianized all the Hellenic aspects of Greek rhetoric to the service of Christian education.

This chapter has dealt with the rhetorical aspects of "arrangement" and "style" in Cyril's work. To get the full picture of Cyril's work we will delve into the "invention" and "arrangement" again in order to understand their impact on his spiritual exegesis. His choice of words was also crucial to understanding his spiritual interpretation. Both parts, the literal and the spiritual, were indivisible and intertwined and permeate his interpretation.

This chapter of the work was dedicated to the literary style of the author since such a study is always useful to have a full comprehension of a writer's interpretation. However, it should also be emphasized that his Alexandrian upbringing and spirituality nourished this literary aspect. Thus, Athanasius' influence on his style of argumentation should be taken into consideration when assessing his method of heretical debates. Even devoting the whole of the commentary to dogmatic exegesis, with an

emphasis on Arius, was greatly influenced by his being an Alexandrian resident where the whole Arian question began. In addition, it is very possible that his literary style could be a good indication of the Alexandrian rhetorical schools educational system of the time. The literary style did not only reveal Cyril's literary aspect, it exposed Cyril's mind revealed through his expressions and his approach and choice of emphasis.

CHAPTER 4

CYRIL'S EXEGETICAL METHOD

PART TWO: SPIRITUAL EXEGESIS

Literary and spiritual exegesis are indivisible. According to Cyril, literary exegesis always precedes the spiritual, and if spiritual exegesis is lacking, then the text under discussion is a text that cannot provide any spiritual or moral value. Since the aim of Scripture is to provide this moral, spiritual, and dogmatic aspect to those who hold it as truth, it is the obligation of biblical exegetes to elaborate on the spiritual aspect otherwise there would be no difference between the grammarian who interprets Homer in the classroom and the Christian teacher who interprets scripture in church or in any setting that has Christian education as its aim.[688] Cyril himself was aware that the process of exegesis involved these two steps. This chapter will begin by demonstrating that Cyril was aware of the two step aspect involved with exegesis. This will be followed by elaborating on the "invention" and "arrangement" in Cyril's exegesis where it becomes clearer that he engaged in the text first on the literary basis. Once he tackled all literary issues of the text, he then proceeded to the spiritual level. He clearly made the transition from one from of exegesis to the other. Cyril was attentive in his writings to the two steps of exegesis and he made his readers

[688] Kannengiesser wrote that scriptural exegesis was not a scientific study limited to experts. He adds, "It was not a secular enterprise which regarded biblical writings as any other literary legacy. Even when using methods and criteria applied by contemporary non-Christian interpreters to classical sources of Hellenic traditions, patristic exegetes never intended to assimilate the Bible to their classical heritage. They did not allegorize *Kings* or *Chronicles* as another *Iliad* nor did they identify Abraham's journey and Moses' long-lasting exodus as a variant of the *Odyssey*." Charles Kannengiesser, "The Bible as Read in the Early Church: Patristic Exegesis and its Presuppositions," in *The Bible and its Readers* (London: SCM, 1991), 31–2.

aware of it. This will serve as an introduction to understanding his use of some exegetical terms in his spiritual exegesis and his use of the Old Testament in interpreting the New Testament.

The importance of investigating the spiritual exegetical method of Cyril is that it will reveal his true aim in undertaking such a huge project of interpreting the Gospel of John. His aim was to reveal to his readers that the type that was hidden within the Old Testament is transferred to the truth in the New Testament.

Cyril's Understanding of the Two-Fold Exegesis

Cyril was aware that his exegetical procedure was divided into a two-fold or two step approach. The illustration will begin with the miracle at Cana of Galilee. After explaining the miracle, Cyril recapitulated all the significant lessons derived from this event. Cyril wrote that the first miracle in the Gospel of John sanctified marriage and made it honorable and abolished the curse of women. In addition, the miracle shows the glory of the Son and consequently the faith of the disciples is strengthened. Cyril considered that these four conclusions when reasoned out from the miracle represent the end of the historical discourse (ἱστορίας λόγος).[689] Nevertheless, he thought that it was necessary to consider another explanation of what has been said and say what has been signified (οἶμαι δὲ δεῖν καὶ ἑτέραν τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπινοεῖσθαι τὴν θεωρίαν, καὶ τί τὸ ἐντεῦθεν ὑποδηλούμενον εἰπεῖν),[690] that is, explain the significance of the miracle.

The other explanation that is not related to the historical discourse (ἱστορίας λόγος) is that the Son is the Bridegroom, made human nature his own, and thus human nature is his bride and wisdom is their offspring. Also, the marriage at Cana was consummated on the third day, the three represents the whole of time, thus the marriage was consummated in the last times.[691] The resurrection was also on the third day where Christ is the Firstborn. Cyril stressed the point that the miracle was performed in Cana of Galilee and not in Jerusalem. Cyril found this a very clear indication that the Jewish synagogue drove away the bridegroom from heaven (τῶν Ἰουδαίων Συναγωγὴ τὸν ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἀπεώσατο νυμφίον) and that the

689 *In Jo.* 1.203.

690 Ibid.

691 Cyril based the third day motif on Hos 6:1–3; *Come, let us return to the Lord; for it is he who has torn, and he will heal us; he has struck down, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him. Let us know, let us press on to know the Lord; his appearing is as sure as the dawn; he will come to us like the showers, like the spring rains that water the earth.*

church of the Gentiles (ἐθνῶν' Εκκλησία) gladly received him.[692] It is to be noticed that the geographical motif of leaving Jewish territory, especially Jerusalem and the Temple, and going into the Gentile areas, was a sign of rejection from the Jews and acceptance of the Gentiles; thus, Christ found it beneficial to perform miracles among those who were ready to accept or accepted the message. As to the wine, it failed those attending the feast, as the Law did not suffice and did not lead to perfection. Nevertheless, the new wine was better than the first, *for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life* (2 Cor 3:6). Cyril ended his spiritual exegesis by writing, let the hearers consider what I say (καὶ νοείτω πάλιν ὁ ἀκροατὴς, ὅ λέγω).[693]

It is clear that Cyril intentionally divided his exegesis into two separate entities, and he indicated the end of one and the beginning of the other. At the end of the historical exegesis he listed all the lessons learned, and at the end of the spiritual one, he exhorted his hearers to consider the spiritual lessons. It seems that he understood that the spiritual exegesis was not for everyone to understand and heed, he therefore considered the first four lessons as acceptable by all, and the spiritual lessons to those who were able to understand and benefit from a "higher" level of interpretation.[694]

In interpreting Jn 4:12–15, Cyril approached the verses from three different angles, but here he did not spell out his division. Jn 4:12,13 was first interpreted as explanatory narration (διήγησις) that the Samaritan woman was beginning to realize that a prophet and not just a thirsty man was speaking to her as the conversation began. This was followed by a historical explanation of the origin of the Samaritans and their relationship to the Babylonians and the tribes of Israel.[695] Jn 4:14 rose to the level of discussing the spiritual water and notes that the Lord calls the tangible water the Holy Spirit.[696] In this set of verses, Cyril covered the two aspects of exegesis and gave greater attention to clarifying some historical facts about the origins of the Samaritan people.

Cyril explained that there were some verses expressed in a human mode (ἀνθρωπίνοις λόγοις) of expression to signify things beyond expression. In addition, there were things that cannot be expressed and are unspeakable by our voices (τὰ ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἄῤῥητα φωναῖς) that were brought to the level of mode of expression in order that we may understand

---

[692] *In Jo.* 1.204.

[693] *In Jo.* 1.205.

[694] The different levels of interpretations targeted to different levels of spirituality resonated a similar approach to that of Origen.

[695] *In Jo.* 1.270–1.

[696] *In Jo.* 1.271.

them.[697] Therefore, any misunderstanding that we experienced in any verse, was solely due to the weakness of words (τὴν τῶν ῥημάτων ἀσθένειαν) that are unable to express the accurate meaning of matters beyond expression.[698] Spiritual exegesis always claimed, together with other things, its vital role in explaining that which is beyond words. The literal was the obvious meaning, the spiritual was that beyond the verbal expression.

Cyril reiterated the same idea not in reference to a biblical verse, but rather regarding attributing human expression of the divine glory, for the words and expressions we use to describe God fails when tested for accuracy and precision. Human expressions are not to be understood as we understand them among ourselves, but as adding further dimension to their meaning as far as they are suitable for the divine nature. The divine glory suffers from the weakness of the human tongue and its poor diction (τὴν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γλώττης ἀσθένειαν καὶ τὴν ἐν λέξει πτωχείαν).[699] Therefore, when things are said concerning God in a manner that is applied to humanity, we should understand it in a manner that is befitting God.[700] The ambiguity that results from human expression regarding that which belongs to God is due to the inherent weakness of our language to express what is beyond expression. At this point the human mind and tongue should understand its limitations and accept the spiritual understanding.

In the previous examples, the ambiguity was unintended but was a result of the weakness of words to express divine ideas. The following example explains that sometimes the words are intended to be expressed enigmatically. Cyril wrote in the heading of Book Three, Chapter Two, that the Jews could not understand that the Son was the image of the Father because they did not understand the words enigmatically spoken by Moses (ὡς μὴ νοοῦντας τὰ διὰ Μωυσέως αἰνιγματωδῶς μᾶλλον εἰρημένα).[701] He commented that Jn 5:37,8 is not a simple passage because the ideas are not set in a simple order; rather it is a swarm of hidden contemplations (ἀλλὰ κεκρυμμένων θεωρημάτων ἑσμὸν).[702] These ideals escaped the mind of the unexamined hearers (τὸν τῶν ἀζητήτως ἐπακροωμένων παριππεύοντα νοῦν).[703] Therefore, the ambiguity of some of the verses, instead of being beyond human expression, could be written in enigmatic

[697] *In Jo.* 2.246.
[698] Ibid.
[699] *In Jo.* 2.258.
[700] Ibid.
[701] *In Jo.* 1.375.
[702] Ibid.
[703] Ibid.

form waiting to be revealed in the light of the Incarnation. Spiritual exegesis helps readers to gain access to this revelation.

A clear demonstration of this principle is the descent of God on Mount Sinai. The descent was a type. Those who did not understand it as a type perceived the images of the descent, not as images of spiritual realities, but of seeing the divine nature physically, even believing that God used a bodily voice.[704] Cyril suggested that to understand the narrative of the descent, as explained in Ex 19:17–19, one must refine the thickness of the letter of the law into spiritual contemplation (πνευματικὴν θεωρίαν).[705] For God's descent was not on a low place but on a mountain, to understand that though God descends to our level of understanding, he is still above us, both in words and thoughts (καὶ λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασι).[706] The height of the doctrines were signified by the mountain, and the words of the Godhead were unclear because they were surrounded by smoke wounding the eyes of our understanding. For Paul testified that we are going to see through a mirror dimly (1 Cor 13:12).[707] Those who did not interpret the Exodus text spiritually, that is, did not apply spiritual exegesis, did not see through the clouds and the smoke of the mountain that covered their eyes. Their dim eyes could not see the loftiness of the revelation but remained confined to the physical sound and voice that was enshrouded in clouds.

Another example of Cyril's clear perception of the two-fold exegesis was demonstrated in Jn 14:8 *Philip said to him, "Lord, show us the Father, and we will be satisfied."* Cyril explained that Philip asked to see the Father with the comprehension that he would see the Father with bodily eyes (τοῖς τοῦ σώματος ὀφθαλμοῖς).[708] If scripture informs us that God appeared in the old days to the prophets, we notice that no two prophets agree on one vision. The vision of Ezekiel was very different from that of Isaiah, therefore, Philip should have understood that we could not see the divine essence.[709] For a thoughtful person, the contemplation in the Son sufficed to represent to us the perfect fullness of the nature of the Father. Having presented these ideas as an explanation of the meaning of the verse, Cyril added that he set forth the meaning of this passage according to the simpler (ἁπλουστέραν) view adopted by most men and now it was necessary to

[704] *In Jo.* 1.378.
[705] *In Jo.* 1.379.
[706] *In Jo.* 1.380.
[707] Ibid.
[708] *In Jo.* 2.417.
[709] *In Jo.* 2.418.

elaborate on the hidden (κεκρυμμένων) meanings.[710] The hidden meaning was elaborated upon for the following three verses. Cyril was very clear about his exegetical procedure and he navigated his readers through both meanings, explaining that they should be attentive to both and not neglect one aspect of the meaning at the expense of the other.

When Cyril contemplated a certain verse and gave an explanation for it, he was aware that his words and interpretation were not final and exhorted his readers to venture and look for further and higher meanings. Cyril thought that the higher meaning of any verse could be elaborated upon by many and to any high level to which they were able. Christ said to Thomas *I am the way, and the truth, and the life* (Jn 14:6), to which Cyril elaborated by saying that scripture has described Christ as light, wisdom, power, and many other names, why is it in this occasion that he chooses to be the way, truth, and life?[711] Cyril explained that the real power of the word is deep and not easily visible. Nevertheless, he did not hesitate from attempting to discover the meaning. Cyril explained that he would write exactly what came to his mind (εἰς ἐμὴν ἀναβαίνει διάνοιαν), commending those who wanted to speculate more keenly (ὀξυωπέστερον) than the customary meaning.[712] Cyril then delved into a more spiritual understanding of the verse regarding the three main things we need to help us attain the divine courts—namely righteousness, faith in orthodox doctrines, and hope in eternal life.[713] Spiritual interpretation and spirituality were open to all to contemplate.

Cyril was also aware that even in regard to the literal explanation, the audience, to whom the words were addressed, may vary in their interpretation of the verse. In Jn 15:22 Christ says *If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin.* Cyril began to speculate who could "them" be. If it were both the Greeks and the Jews, then the message came to every individual on earth and made clear the work of righteousness to everyone. Therefore, if the Jews were ignorant of the work of righteousness they would have been worthy of pardon, but since the message was directed to everyone then there was no excuse.[714] If these words were addressed only to the Jews, then, as has previously been illustrated through the entire Gospel, they would endure the Gospel

---

[710] *In Jo.* 2.419.

[711] *In Jo.* 2.408.

[712] *In Jo.* 2.409.

[713] Ibid. The section discussing the three virtues that lead us to the divine courts was discussed in Chapter One as an example of Cyril's spirituality.

[714] *In Jo.* 2.599.

teachings and would persecute those who love Christ.[715] Cyril then elaborated on the excuses that the Jews would have given for not following the Gospel message. Here, Cyril was speculating on the targeted audience and gave a different interpretation in each case.

In his writing, Cyril indicated more than once that he consciously considered two levels of interpretations and pointed out to his readers that he intentionally approached a verse or text from different angles.[716] The spiritual meaning could be hidden, intentionally or unintentionally. It was the interpreters' task to help the reader unveil the obscurities of the text, but all were welcomed to venture contemplation to a higher level of interpretation.

Cyril's writing was carefully crafted, and in order to further understand his spiritual interpretation it is necessary to look carefully at the way he composed his arguments. Therefore, a closer look at his "arrangement" and "invention" is necessary at this point of research.

Arrangement and Invention

Arrangement and invention are two components of the five parts of speech in rhetoric. Invention is the planning of the speech, and once planning is

---

[715] *In Jo.* 2.600.

[716] Kerrigan writes that in some passages "the literal sense is complete in itself, since it serves its own purpose and does not need to be transposed into a higher sense." Kerrigan adds that "More numerous by far are the instances in which, whilst recognizing the existence of the literal sense, he implicitly avows that it is incomplete on the grounds that it is but the αἴνιγμα or the εἰκών or παράδειγμα or τύπος of a higher meaning." A. Kerrigan, "The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses of the New Testament according to St. Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica* 1 (-TU 63), Berlin (1057), 360. Kerrigan's thesis is that "An examination of his commentaries on the Old Testament led to the conclusion that the distinction between the literal sense of the Old Testament and its spiritual sense lies chiefly in the nature of the objects described by them." Kerrigan concluded in his article that the same principle holds for New Testament exegesis. Ibid., 354. De Margerie explains what is meant by the "nature of the objects." He writes, "that which is human belongs to the literal sense, that which is divine to the spiritual sense." Bernard De Margerie, "Saint Cyril of Alexandria Develops a Christocentric Exegesis," in *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis*, trans. Leonard Maluf, vol. 1 (Petersham, Mass.: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993), 243. This theory that the "nature of the object" decides the type of exegesis whether literal or spiritual does not hold with the present research in which we find Cyril attempting the literal exegesis first, to the whole of the Gospel text, and then tries to seek a spiritual interpretation if a type of enigmatic meaning is within the text.

set, arrangement follows. Arrangement includes the way to introduce the topic and what arguments and proofs are needed to reach the conclusion.[717] In the previous chapter, I discussed the literary style of Cyril and one example of forensic composition that dealt with heretics was examined. This chapter will elaborate on the other parts of speech, that is, invention and arrangement. The aim is to convey the setting within which Cyril expressed his spiritual exegesis and the context within which he elaborated upon his Old Testament treatises and references. To achieve this aim, this research will take Book Three as a case study to discuss invention first, then arrangement, followed by an examination of choice of words that express spiritual exegesis, and the use of Old Testament in interpreting the New Testament. The choice of Book Three is based on practical reasons. It is the shortest book in the commentary and includes some demonstrative examples of Cyril's exegetical procedure.[718]

The following lengthy exposition shows how well he mastered his art (τέχνη) of rhetoric, especially arrangement and invention. He had a general, partially poetic introduction for the whole chapter which gave us the indication that it was going to involve divine contemplation (τῶν θείων θεωρημάτων). Then, Cyril introduced each chapter of the book with a heading that summarized the goal of what he was about to present to his readers. This could be considered the "proposition" for each chapter.[719] In the first chapter he also introduced to the readers the method of inquiry; it was going to be a "critical inquiry." Though guided by the Gospel narrative, he had his own choice of themes to be presented in each chapter. In the first chapter he presented the Baptist as a person who does not give light of his own but rather he was a type of a lamp that burned and shone but not of his own. He compared the Baptist to other saints. This was proof

---

[717] For more detailed information about "Invention" in Greek rhetoric read Malcom Heath, "Invention," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89–119.

[718] Though the focus will be on Book Three as the basis of the case study, the research will pull citations and examples from the whole text of the commentary.

[719] Narration (διήγησις) includes "a clear statement of the proposition and the reason for its proposal." Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 42. Rhetorical syllogism and reason (rationale) could be part of the proposition. Moreover, the propositions could include a host of things such as "maxims, proverbs, chreiai (anecdotes), citations, as well as stock themes or issues from popular ethical philosophy." Ibid. The "proposition" is where the Christian writers differed from their pagan counterparts, as will be seen as this investigation progresses.

(πίστις) by analogy.[720] At this point, Cyril resorted to the Old Testament to contemplate the lamp in the Tabernacle. This was proven by citing a passage from the Old Testament. This was the same authority that he used in forensic arguments against the heretics. Once Cyril was comfortable in the Old Testament setting, he elaborated on a comparison of the sequence of events in the Old Testament with that of the New Testament. He thus proved that the choice of the Apostles was foreshadowed in the Old Testament events. This was another set of proofs by analogy. The comparison between the light of the Baptist and the far superior light of Christ was elaborated upon to show that the Baptist was a witness or testimony to the Son himself. He concluded the themes of lamp, tabernacle, and witness to assert the Baptist was a witness to the Son. The elements of arrangement and invention were complete.

Chapter Two began by stating the proposition in the heading that the Son is the impress of the Father and this being the case can be proved even from the Law. Cyril proposed that his aim is to uncover the hidden meaning in the verses allotted to this chapter. He first tended to the literary issues of the text then he attended to the hidden meaning. The Pharisees did not really understand what Moses said about Christ, since they could not understand the hidden meaning in the Law. Therefore, Chapter Three, was some sort of an extension of Chapter Two—it set out to prove that the Pharisees did not really understand the Law. This is how Cyril explained Deut 18:15–19. He thus proved by citing authority—citing the Old Testament—that the Pharisees did not understand the hidden meaning. He proved his proposition and by this he ends the first theme by the completion of Book Three.

Chapter Four was the beginning of a fresh theme that was linked to the beginning of a new scene triggered by the journey from Jerusalem to Galilee. The new theme was the transference of grace from the Jews who refused Christ to the Gentiles who accepted him. The Gentiles accepted Christ when they followed him for the whole day and at the end of the day, in the evening, needed food. Cyril took this opportunity to introduce some spiritual and moral themes such as that of hospitality. The feeding of the multitudes was an opportunity to begin introducing the connection of the miraculous feeding on the mount to that in Exodus, that is, the manna. Nevertheless, Cyril skillfully delayed the discussion of the manna. He attended to the deeper meaning of the text on various occasions, such as elaborating on the meaning of numbers. For instance, what he considered

[720] Discussed in Chapter Three.

the five loaves and the two fishes to really signify. He again interrupted the sequence of the exegesis to give a summary, a spiritual summary of what was said. It is not clear, whether this practice was common among rhetors. However, Cyril often recapitulated his ideas in summaries. It can be suggested that this was a rhetorical device to recapture the attention of his readers so that they were better able to follow his arguments. Maybe in public presentations he was able to change the pitch of his voice or introduce any other rhetorical device to captivate his audience. Nevertheless, when readings were lengthy and tackled complicated topics such as dogma and Old Testament comparisons, it can be suggested that summaries were a means to refocus his readers. An organized mind, like that of Cyril's, might have found that this was the only device he could think of to keep the attention of his readers. The summary ended the scene and the Gospel text presented us with the walking on water event. At this point there did not seem to be an arrangement or invention; it can be suggested that Cyril was bound to follow the Gospel text. It was a commentary, and following the text sequence was, after all, the main guiding line of the commentator. Nevertheless, Cyril used this opportunity to elaborate on spiritual and moral themes. Other than the theme of hospitality presented earlier, he connected the miracle of feeding the multitudes with that of walking on water as signifying the Apostles and the Church. Chapter Five was an opportunity to focus on spiritual exegesis without worry about rhetorical guidelines.

Chapter Five ended with the multitudes asking Christ for a sign like the one that Moses gave in the desert, and this served as the introduction to the theme of manna that was tackled in detail in Chapter Six. As in Chapter One, there was a comparison between the Baptist and Christ where one of its conclusions was that Christ was superior to the Baptist; the same theme is followed in Chapter Six. In Chapter Six, we have a comparison between the manna and the Eucharist, thus the giver of the Eucharist was superior to Moses, the giver of the manna. Since both were divine gifts, the theme of Grace and divine gifts round the conclusion of Book Three. These points will now be discussed in more detail.

Use of poetic images in spiritual interpretation. Book Three was divided into six chapters. The proem used some poetic images from the sea. Cyril thus introduced Book Three by writing that he had just set down his pen (or more accurately his reed, κάλαμον) after swimming in the deep and wide sea of divine contemplation (καὶ τῶν θείων θεωρημάτων τὸ πλατύ

τε καὶ βαθὺ διανηξάμενοι πέλαγος)[721] intending to reach the port, as if the harbor was our end destination, and just then there was another ocean. For Cyril this other ocean was like the beginning of another sequel.[722] Therefore, each chapter for Cyril was like a sea, the termination of which was equal to a ship arriving to port to anchor, but at this point, the captain realized that there was another sea to cross before reaching the harbor. The sea image might seem to be an extremely conventional one and thus not call for our attention. Rather, the studies of images in the sophist and Christian writers revealed that all these images were driven from a standard set of sources. These were usually "medicine, the games, nature and pastoral images, sea images, the army, the arts and technology."[723] Though studies informed us that these images were distinctively rhetorical, Ruether warned us that we should not easily dismiss them. On her comment on Gregory's use of the image of life as a tumultuous sea, she writes,

> This passage should serve to warn the modern student of ancient rhetoric and literature against a common pitfall. It is too easily assumed that, because an idea is a commonplace, it is *merely* a commonplace, and that when such commonplaces are used they are automatically to be written off as fictional or as not expressing the author's real feelings. The mind-sets of a culture do not merely affect the window-dressing of its ideas; they affect the way the people in that culture think, and finally they condition the way they actually experience things. The idea of the sea as the symbol of the instability of life, and the rock as the unmovable sage, was an absolutely stock *topos* in classical thought of this period, found alike in the pagan and the Christian authors.[724]

Ruether concluded that these images do, actually, represent meaningful experiences for the writers who use them. Therefore, Cyril's proem should receive some attention, first for its poetic imagery and, second because Cyril in his writing, which is usually more argumentative and factually oriented, showed that this introduction was an attempt on Cyril's part to show some stylistic and rhetorical eloquence.

Chapter heading sets the trajectory of "critical inquiry" followed by "deep meaning." The heading of the first chapter set the trajectory of the

---

[721] *In Jo.* 1.365.

[722] Ibid.

[723] Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus*, 80. In the previous chapter we noticed that Cyril used the games image in the temple scene and the army image borrowed from Homer.

[724] Ibid., 96.

rationalization. The heading indicated that the chapter was going to be a "critical inquiry" (ζήτησις ἀκριβὴς) why the Baptist is called by Christ not only the lamp but burning and shining (ἀλλὰ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων).[725] Chapter One explicated Jn 5:35–37a, where the first verse described the Baptist being a burning and shining lamp. Cyril explained that a lamp does not have light of its own but its light is from without. So are the saints who are illuminated from Christ in the Spirit. This is different from Christ who is the Light by nature. Therefore, the Baptist was a lamp according to the above explanation.[726] This is an example of syllogistic reasoning that Cyril often used. Christ is Light. Lamps do not have lights of their own. Saints also do not have light of their own, but have it from Christ. Therefore, the Baptist was like the saints who take light from Christ, thus like a lamp that takes light from another. Therefore, the Baptist was a lamp. Also, we can conclude that the Baptist was not Christ. The second part of the verse, *and you were willing to rejoice for a while in his light* means, according to Cyril, that the Jews followed the Baptist for a while and then changed their minds when he testified on behalf of Christ.

Therefore Cyril gave his first set of explanations, which he considered to be the meaning that is well trodden and the commonly used interpretation (τὸν εὐτριβῆ ... τῆς ἑρμηνείας τρόπον).[727] In Cyril's opinion the lamp cannot signify only the Baptist, but must have another dimension since the words of the Savior extend to deep meaning (ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὁ λόγος εἰς βαθείας ἡμᾶς καταείνων ἐννοίας) because this is the only way we can track the beauty of the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ κάλλος).[728] Cyril then proceeded to interpret the whole verse from a perspective of a deeper meaning.

The Baptist was not only a lamp but also burning and shining. If the Baptist was only a lamp, the reader would recall Ps 132:17 *I have prepared a lamp for my anointed one* and take it that the Baptist was the one to whom the prophecy applied. However, when *burning and shining* is added to the verse, then one must look beyond the prophecy and search for a prefiguring of the Law, as a figure and shadow of John (ὡς ἐν σχήματι πάλιν καὶ σκιᾷ τὴν Ἰωάνου).[729] For Cyril this was directly connected to the tabernacle and the oil of the lamp in Ex 27: 20*ff, you shall further command the Israelites to bring you pure oil of beaten olives for the light, so that a lamp may be set up to burn regularly.*

[725] *In Jo.* 1.365.
[726] *In Jo.* 1.366–7.
[727] *In Jo.* 1.368.
[728] Ibid.
[729] Ibid.

Cyril then explained that at this point one should take the explanation to all possible truths (πρὸς τὴν ἐνδεχομένην σαφήνειαν).[730] Accordingly, there are two different levels in Cyril's spiritual explanation. The first level goes beyond the literal meaning and identified what the Old Testament text provided as a figure and shadow to the event or verse of the New Testament. After the identification, the pursuit of the meaning followed. Therefore, Cyril found the pure oil to represent the nature of the Holy Spirit, which nourishes and illuminates the soul, as in a lamp.[731] Therefore, the Baptist was the type (ἐν τύπῳ) of a lamp that was burning and shining in the tabernacle of testimony (ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου).[732]

Commentary's chapter conclusion. Cyril continued his interpretation of the set of verses he set for Chapter One concluding, that, though the Baptist, the lamp, was depicted in the Law and the Prophets, the Jewish leaders did not believe the Baptist. Now that Christ had a greater witness than the Baptist—for the Father testified on his behalf—they did not believe Christ either. Cyril ended this chapter by the testimony of the Father on behalf of Christ, in the middle of verse thirty-seven. For Cyril, Jn 5:35–37a formed a unit of the Baptist being a lamp who was shining and burning. This lamp was foreshadowed in the Law and was burning and shining in the tabernacle of testimony. The Baptist who shone and gave light and testimony for the coming of Christ was not believed. Now the Father was sending the Son and the Father was a witness to the Son. The theme of Baptist, lamp, tabernacle, testimony, Baptist as witness, and Father as witness formed a complete idea for Cyril and he thus decided to resume interpretation of the rest of the verse in the following chapter.

Deeper meaning of events' sequence. Another aspect of the passage was the order of events. After the completion of the tabernacle came the ordering of the lamp, and this was followed by the appointment and function of the priests. For Cyril, this was not intended to present a simple narration of events but rather hold a deeper meaning; in other words, after the completion of the law and the Prophets there appeared, the voice of the forerunner—the ordering of the lamp—after which the ordination of the Apostles occurred—appointment of the Aaronic priesthood. At this point Cyril informed his readers that the consideration of the lamp was completed.[733] The sequence of events for Cyril frequently played an

730 *In Jo.* 1.369.
731 Ibid.
732 Ibid.
733 *In Jo.* 1.371.

important role in his interpretation.[734] Even the choice of the Apostles after the testimony of the Baptist was foreshadowed in the Old Testament. For Cyril the sequence of events represented a divine scheme that had to be contemplated and could not be dismissed by a serious interpreter delving into the deep meaning of scripture.

Explaining the "literary problems" followed by "hidden contemplation." Chapter Two interpreted Jn 5:37b–46. Cyril summarized the topics he would discuss in the chapter in his heading where he wrote that the Son is the Image of the Father and that the Jews did not understand the words uttered enigmatically (αἰνιγματωδῶς) by Moses.[735] He introduced the chapter by writing that there was a "swarm of hidden contemplations," and he informed his readers of his intention to contemplate the hidden meaning of the text. Again, the chapter heading set the trajectory of rationalization of the chapter.

Jn 5:37b–8 *You have never heard his voice or seen his form, and you do not have his word abiding in you, because you do not believe him whom he has sent*. The Pharisees neither heard nor saw the Father. Cyril commented that Christ always answered the thoughts of the Pharisees, and thus he is by nature God and knew the depth of their hearts. Moreover, he gives the examples of Christ's knowledge of the hearts of men by referring to the Lukan pericope of the hanging down of the paralytic from the ceiling by four of his friends and that Jesus perceived their thoughts (Lk 5:22).[736] He also refered to Lk 6:6–9 where Christ answered the words in their hearts when he questioned those witnessing the miracle of healing of the man with the withered hand whether healing on the Sabbath is good or evil. After a long discussion of the issue of the Sabbath, Cyril interpreted the verse explaining that the problem with the Pharisees was that they considered themselves the keepers of the Law, therefore, they were the ones who heard his voice on the Mount. Based on this authority, the Pharisees designated for themselves the right to pose the question, who is this man?[737] Cyril seized the opportunity to point out that Jews did not understand the revelation on

[734] On another occasion when Cyril was interpreting Jn 6:16,17 he posed the question as to why the miracle of walking on the water was introduced after the miracle of feeding the people?

[735] *In Jo.* 1.375. This heading together with the introduction to the chapter was discussed under Cyril's Understanding of the Two-Fold Exegesis.

[736] *In Jo.* 1.376.

[737] *In Jo.* 1.377.

Mount Sinai where they thought that the divine nature could be seen through the physical eyes and that God used a physical voice.[738]

Jn 5:38–9 begins with a literary problem in the verse, where Cyril argued that the verb should not be read in the imperative mood.[739] In Jn 5:41–46, Cyril followed the text and gave some attention to the idea that Christ was not an ambitious leader seeking followers and disciples for he did not receive honor from man. It is the Pharisees who were seeking honor by attributing to themselves the discipleship of Moses. If they were true disciples of Moses they would have believed Christ, since Moses wrote about him. This is the end of Chapter Two and Cyril took this opportunity to elaborate on the testimony of Moses for Christ. Chapter Three is devoted to Deut 18:15–19 where Cyril introduced it with the heading, "that Moses was indicating the coming of the Savior."[740] The elaboration on Deut 18:15–19 was directly connected to Chapter Two. Since the Jews were unable to hear the message from the Law and Prophecy about the coming of a Savior, Cyril attempted to devote a chapter to prove the presence of the message in the Old Testament and the ignorance of the Jewish leadership who could not decipher it.

Chapter Four focused on Jn 6:1–27a. The new chapter was the beginning of a different scene, where Christ left Jerusalem for Galilee. The reason for leaving Jerusalem was again because of the confrontation with the Jews. At the end of this episode Cyril wrote that leaving Jerusalem was a sign of transferring Grace from the Jews to the Gentiles.[741]

For Cyril, the general order of John 4 to John 6 was as follows. The Pharisees heard that Christ was baptizing and attracting more disciples, Christ anticipated a confrontation and left to Galilee passing by Sychar where he met the Samaritan woman. He left Samaria heading to Galilee avoiding Nazareth. He remained there and healed the official's son. In Jn 5, Christ went to Jerusalem to attend "a festival of the Jews." Christ healed on the Sabbath, there was another confrontation and Christ announced that the Father testifies for him. The Jews did not accept his testimony and,

---

[738] *In Jo.* 1.379. The discussion of this section where the descent on the Mount of Sinai is a type was explained under Cyril's Understanding of the Two-Fold Exegesis.

[739] Jn 5:38 and the imperative mood was discussed in Chapter Three in greater detail.

[740] *In Jo.* 1.391. The chapter devoted to Deut 18:15–19 will be discussed in more detail under the use of the Old Testament in Cyril's New Testament interpretation.

[741] *In Jo.* 1.397. This point was discussed in Chapter Three under both "Verse Division" and "Geography."

because of this confrontation, Christ again left Jerusalem and traveled to Galilee by crossing the other side of the Sea of Galilee. In Galilee Christ administered more miracles. The sequence of the previous three Gospel chapters affirmed Cyril's opinion that every time Christ left Jerusalem it was due to a confrontation with the Pharisees and Christ departed from Jerusalem and proclaimed the message to the Gentiles through his miracles. Therefore, the sequence of biblical events again impacted the exegesis. Departure from Jerusalem should not be considered only as the historical narrative of the physical journey from one place to another but also the deeper theological and spiritual meaning and that is the departure of Grace from the Jews to the Gentiles.

Jn 6:2–4 describes the crowds following Christ. Cyril first approached the obvious meaning that those who followed Christ were the pious people who, because of the miracles they saw, decided to follow Christ.[742] Cyril then regarded this as an opportunity to compare the impact of miracles on two peoples. The Pharisees were jealous when they saw the miracles and the following of the multitudes while the Gentiles and other pious people considered the miracles as a cause to follow him more zealously. However, the concealed meaning (ἐγκεκρύφθαι διάνοιαν)[743] revealed three types of people following Christ. Those who followed Christ were either admirers of his works and miracles, envious Pharisees, or close disciples who followed him under persecution and went *up into the mountain* and *sat with* him (Jn 6:3).[744] Those who sat with him received the greatest grace and sat with him on the twelve thrones and judged the twelve tribes of Israel.[745] The motif of the transference of Grace is still observable. Cyril began by tackling the literary problems of the text, elaborated on its content, gave attention to certain topics, then the reader was ready to understand the hidden and spiritual meaning of the text. In the case of John 4 to John 6, Christ's departure from Jerusalem indicated the departure of Grace from the Jews to the Gentiles.

The virtue of hospitality reflects Cyril's moral and spiritual concerns. In Jn 6:5–7, Christ asks for food for the multitudes and Philip answers that there is not enough to feed them. Cyril took the opportunity to speak about the virtue of hospitality. Even the rich might hesitate to be hospitable to huge crowds, for it is simple to be hospitable to the few, but it is courage

742 *In Jo.* 1.404.
743 *In Jo.* 1.405.
744 Ibid.
745 *In Jo.* 1.406.

that is needed to boldly feed the many.[746] Cyril added to the moral aspect a more spiritual stance (θεωρίαν πνευματικὴν) to the verse when he commented that Christ lifting up his eyes indicated that those who love him are worthy of the divine visitation (τῆς θείας ἐπισκέψεως ἀξίους).[747] Furthermore, in Jn 6:7, when Philip thought that money was the only means to get food, Christ proved to him that the divine powers are superior to the natural order of things.[748] When the narrative was simple—that is, it did not involve a deeper or enigmatic meaning—and related to an event such as a miracle, Cyril seized the opportunity to attend to the moral and spiritual aspects of the narrative since the dogmatic aspect was more difficult to pursue.

Jn 6:8,9 mentions Andrew's reasoning that five loaves and two fishes cannot feed the multitude. At this point, Cyril began to connect the feeding of the multitude with Exodus and the feeding of manna in the desert. Cyril also suggested that the disciples should have belief lest they follow the example of Moses who did not believe and smote the rock and was punished for his unbelief and did not enter the Promised Land (Num 20:10,11).[749] Though it is common to connect the feeding of the multitude with the manna, at this point Cyril made a decision of simply alerting the reader to the connection and did not proceed to elaborate on the manna. In fact, he reserved the elaboration on the manna for Chapter Six of the same book. Invention and arrangement were clear at this point, where he intentionally postponed specific themes seeking better arrangement.

Jn 6:10 makes a distinction between the people (ἀνθρώπους) who sat down and the five thousand men (ἄνδρες) who were counted and Cyril took the opportunity to comment on that distinction. Cyril interpreted this as Christ offering food to those who were manly and did not have an effeminate (ἐκθηλύνεσθαι) character.[750] The emphasis on the bravery and power of men and their refined spiritual understanding was one of the distinguishing traits in Cyril's writing.[751]

---

[746] *In Jo.* 1.406.

[747] *In Jo.* 1.407.

[748] *In Jo.* 1.409.

[749] *In Jo.* 1.413.

[750] *In Jo.* 1.415.

[751] For a general summary of Cyril's attitude towards women in his writings refer to Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 126–140. Cyril acknowledged the image of God in every human being regardless of gender. On the spiritual level he did not differentiate, but he often commented on the effeminate nature as being evil, that is, not manly in virtue.

Cyril captured the opportunity of Jn 6:11 to suggest that if the Evangelist took great care in his narration to describe the quantity and type of bread then he gave us something to think about. Cyril thought, and those who are fond of learning contemplated more powerful things (καὶ σκοπείτω τὸ κρεῖττον ὁ φιλομαθὴς), and that the five loaves of barley referred to the five books of Moses.[752] Barley hinted to the coarser food that is the Law. The fishes referred to the Gospels and the Epistles of the New Testament. In this miracle, Christ mixed the two—barley and fish—to nourish the souls.[753] When Cyril found the biblical text paying attention to details like numbers, or kind, he was of the opinion that it cannot be mentioned just for historical reasons, there must be a deeper meaning.[754] At the same time he considered this interpretation as a suggestion that could be adjusted or improved by whoever was capable of doing so.

Jn 6:12,13 describes the gathering of the fragments left over and again, since it was an event of simple narrative, Cyril introduced a moral interpretation about the value of hospitality. The verses also indicated that there were twelve baskets filled and Cyril interpreted it to refer to the Apostles who dispensed for us the spiritual food.[755] In Jn 6:14–15 Cyril came a full circle and returned to the main theme that guided the early parts of the chapter. The people who followed Christ and believed in him wanted to honor him and make him a king in comparison to the Jews who condemned themselves by not accepting him.[756]

Spiritual Summaries: a distinctive feature of Cyril's exegesis. After interpreting Jn 6:15, Cyril seized the opportunity to break the sequence of interpretation and presented a summary—a spiritual summary—of what was said. He writes,

> But our discourse is not without share of spiritual contemplation, on which account we will surely inquire, summing up as it were the whole force of what has been done, and setting before you the summation of the discourse from the beginning.
> Πνευματικῶν δὲ θεωρημάτων ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν οὐκ ἀμοιρεῖ, διὸ δὴ πάλιν ἐροῦμεν, ὅλην ὥσπερ ἀνακεφαλαιούμενοι τῶν

[752] *In Jo.* 1.417.

[753] *In Jo.* 1.418.

[754] In the previous chapter we discussed Cyril's attention to details when Jn 21:7–14 was discussed in which Cyril elaborated on the meaning of the hundred and fifty-three fish caught *In Jo.* 3.161–3.

[755] *In Jo.* 1.421.

[756] *In Jo.* 1.421–4.

γεγενημένων τὴν δύναμιν, καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῶν προκειμένων ἀναμηρυσάμενοι λόγον.[757]

Cyril began his summary from the last verse in the pericope under consideration where, after Christ performed the miracle *he withdrew again to the mountain by himself* (Jn 6:15). He then connected Christ's withdrawal from Jerusalem and crossing of Lake Tiberias sitting on the mount and feeding the multitudes and again leaving the crowds and withdrawing to the mountain. Cyril pointed out the constant theme of withdrawal *from* and *going to* the mountain. His being on the mountain and feeding the crowds signified the supervision from above that was due to the saints.[758] Cyril suggested that the five barley loaves and the two fish ought to be understood as the writings of the Old and the New Testaments; moreover, it signified the disciples receiving the fruits of ministry. Christ's withdrawal and departure alone to the mountain signifies Christ being the first fruit *who will ascend to the hill of the Lord? And who shall stand in his holy place? Those who have clean hands and pure hearts* (Ps 24:3). Those who followed Christ are the pure of heart, and are the ones who followed him to the mountain in contrast to the Jews who were jealous of him. He was the one who leads *to the hill of the Lord*. Withdrawing signified going to heaven. After finishing this summary, Cyril attached another summary that was described as short (ἐν ὀλίγῳ).[759] He reiterated the message in the assertion that after Christ left the Jewish people and was received as King by the Gentiles and later performing miracles among them, he ascended into heaven *alone* (μόνος) waiting for the time when the kingdom would be more manifest.[760] A summary followed by a shorter summary was a means by which Cyril conveyed his message. He knew about what he was speaking, he formed his invention and arrangement to convey the message, and he ended the message with a summary, equivalent to the epilogue of the rhetor. The whole passage of Jn 6:1–16, which begins with arrival to Galilee after withdrawal from Jerusalem until the withdrawal from the multitudes to the mountains was taken as one unit of interpretation with a clear message. The message was conveyed by delving into the deeper meaning of the passage. Though Cyril began with the literary interpretation, and paid much attention to literary details, his aim was always the spiritual meaning.

Scene transition. Jn 6:16–17a is the beginning of a new pericope that begins with the departure of Christ from the scene. The change of the stage

[757] *In Jo.* 1.424.
[758] *In Jo.* 1.425.
[759] *In Jo.* 1.425.
[760] *In Jo.* 1.425–6.

of events was always a signal for the end or the beginning of the literary segment upon which Cyril was working.[761] This pericope was about Christ walking on the water. Cyril posed the question of why the miracle of walking on the water was introduced after the miracle of feeding the people.[762] The sequence of events always maintained a spiritual or theological significance for Cyril. Cyril responded to the question by saying that at the time of the feeding of the multitudes, Philip and Andrew thought he could not do something out of the ordinary to feed the multitudes. They thought he was powerless. Christ wanted to prove to his Apostles, that everything is possible to God and that the nature of things cannot hinder him.[763] This was the theological introduction to the pericope.

The literal and spiritual meaning of the miracle of walking on the water. Jn 6:17–21 is the pericope of Christ walking on the water to the boat. Cyril gave a short exegesis that was quite to the point that Christ will deliver us from danger and that he comes to the rescue when fear is at its height. He does not only save from danger but *delivers* to safety as Christ took the boat to shore.[764] This was a straightforward, or simple, interpretation of the pericope. As has become Cyril's method of interpretation, the narrative was interpreted first from a literary perspective and then he attempted to find a spiritual meaning. Thus Cyril writes, "since we have set before us every portion of the subject singly, let us work, come let us join the meaning of the first part with what follows weaving a spiritual interpretation (πνευματικὴν ἐξυφήνωμεν θεωρίαν)."[765] By "the first part" Cyril meant the previous pericope. Therefore, as Christ ascended to the mountain he also ascended to heaven after the resurrection (this is the first part). After the resurrection the disciples were left alone, they were representing all who follow ecclesiastical teachers (διδασκάλων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν) who swim in the sea of the present life, alone, facing all those who oppose the faith. Nonetheless, they will be freed from all danger when Christ appears in his power, for this is what it means to walk on the sea, where the sea is taken as

[761] Donatus, in his commentary on the Andria, analyzes "the arrangement of the play (τάξις) into acts and scenes and notes that it is very difficult to determine how the play should be divided." Donatus "suggests that the principal criterion for determining the conclusion of an act is that none of the actors remain on stage; scenes, on the other hand, can be distinguished by the entrance or exit of one or more characters." In Cassel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Science of the Grammarians*, 150.

[762] *In Jo.* 1.426.

[763] *In Jo.* 1.427.

[764] *In Jo.* 1.426–430.

[765] *In Jo.* 1.430.

a type of the world. When Christ returns, the ship of the Apostles—that is, the Church—will be taken to safety, that is, to the land.[766] Christ came to his disciples in the night while they were watching for him. Cyril connected the watchfulness of the disciples at night with the parable of the five wise and five foolish virgins (Mt 25: 1–13). Both the disciples and the virgins were watchful, waiting for the Bridegroom. When Christ comes he does not enter the ship but rather moves the ship to land, for when the Lord comes he will not be co-working (συνεργήσων) with his disciples any more but will reward them for what they have achieved already, since his arrival will be at the end of times.[767] The miracle of walking on the water was not only interpreted in theological terms, as to show the dominion of Christ over nature and him being all-powerful, but Cyril also gave it a more eschatological understanding. Jn 6:22–27a was a simple literary systematic following of the text. This concluded Chapter Four of Book Three.

Dogmatic interpretation. Chapter Five began with Jn 6:27b, *which the Son of Man will give you. For it is on him that God the Father has set his seal.* The theme that the Son is the seal and impress of the Father is such an important theological theme that Cyril decided to devote the whole chapter to its discussion. He therefore ended the previous chapter in the middle of verse twenty-seven, reserving one full chapter on the Son being the impress of the Father. Since the Son is the impress of the Father, he is equal to the Father and one with him; thus, the Arian dogmas were challenged. In addition, since this is primarily an anti-Arian defense, Cyril justified that in his invention and arrangement he should devote the whole chapter to this dogmatic theme. Jn 6:27b–31 served as a unit that expressed a full dogmatic idea. This division and arrangement fit the scopes of the interpretation. Since the previous chapter devoted a section to heretical argumentation, we will consider that enough attention was devoted to this issue and proceed to the following chapter.

Use of Old Testament types in Cyril's exegesis. Chapter Five ended with the multitude asking Christ for a sign as the one that Moses gave in the desert, that is, the manna. Cyril commented that they had already seen this sign when they ate the five loaves and two fishes on the mount. For the second time in Book Three, Cyril did not comment on the manna but rather ended the chapter on this note.[768] Chapter Six began with Jn 6:32, *Then Jesus said to them, "Very truly, I tell you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread*

[766] *In Jo.* 1.430–1.
[767] *In Jo.* 1.432–433.
[768] *In Jo.* 1.455.

from heaven, but it is my Father who gives you the true bread from heaven. Cyril derived the opportunity of the *bread of haven* to speak about the manna. The heading of Chapter Six was "concerning the manna, that it is a type (τύπος) of Christ's presence, and of the spiritual graces through him."[769] Since Cyril believed that the Jews cleaved to the type (τύπῳ) and not the truth, he decided to begin contemplation (θεωρήματα) on the subject of the manna.[770] He decided to discuss everything written about the manna in the Mosaic books (τῶν Μωυσαϊκῶν βιβλίων).[771] He further informed his readers that his aim was to prove that every reference demonstrates that Christ is the true manna (ὅτι τὸ μάννα τὸ ἀληθινὸν αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς).[772] Cyril believed that the quotes in the Law about the manna were clear in terms of history (ἱστορίας) and he therefore decided to delve into the spiritual (τὸ πνευματικόν) meaning only.[773] After ending his long contemplation on the manna he proceeded to Jn 6:34 *They [the disciples] said to him, "Sir, give us this bread always."* The disciples, in their demand for the availability of bread to them were carnal in their imagination and demands, and still viewed themselves as of the earth, and desired a full belly. Cyril immediately connected the request of the disciples for bread to the request of the Samaritan woman for water. Scripture was one unit for the early church exegetes, when one verse triggered to the mind the worldly demands and the inability to comprehend the spiritual aspect of bread or water, Cyril easily connected both references.

Metaphor as a source of spiritual exegesis. Jn 6:35a, *I am the bread of life* is a verse that has no other meaning except one of a spiritual nature. It cannot be taken literally. From the rhetorical aspect this is considered a "metaphor" which by definition "is a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea but used in place of another in such a way that it suggests a likeness or an analogy between them."[774] Therefore, in this case, Cyril did not venture any literal interpretation but writes,

> It is the custom of our Savior Christ when describing the more divine and already proclaimed mysteries, to weave his discourse upon them enigmatically and not very transparently.

---

[769] *In Jo.* 1.456.

[770] *In Jn.* 1.458.

[771] Ibid.

[772] *In Jo.* 1.459.

[773] Ibid. The segment devoted to the manna will be discussed in more detail under the use of the Old Testament in Cyril's exegesis of the New Testament.

[774] Rowe, *Style*, 126.

> Ἔθος τῷ Σωτῆρι Χριστῷ τὰς περὶ τῶν θειοτέρων καὶ τῶν ἤδη προκατηγγελμένων μυστηρίων ποιουμένῳ διηγήσεις, αἰνιγματώδη πως καὶ οὐ σφόδρα διαφανῆ τὰ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐξυφαίνειν διηγήματα.[775]

Christ intentionally wanted unveiled (ἀκατακάλυπτον) words to be set before the unholy (ἀνοσίοις).[776] Therefore, literarily, the verse is a metaphor, but Cyril attributed the intention of the metaphor to a more theological aspect, that mysteries were not to be unveiled before the uninitiated and the impure of heart. Thus, Cyril's explanation that *I will open my mouth in a parable* (Ps 78:2) was an indication of such instances where his hearers were unable to understand what he said. Therefore, Cyril explained that when Christ said that he was *the bread of life*, he introduced grace and life through his holy body and life was introduced to humanity. He overcame death because he is superior to death.[777] Cyril concluded his comments on this verse by again referring to the manna and that the bread of life is greater than the manna. This also served as an introduction to the following division, that is, the second half of the verse, where not only is the bread of life greater than the manna but also *whoever comes to me will never be hungry, and whoever believes in me will never be thirsty* (Jn 6:35b).

Jn 6:35b, the continuation of the previous division, contains also a hidden (κέκρυπταί) meaning.[778] Christ used a means of instruction similar to that which he used with the Samaritan woman. She asked if he was greater than Jacob and the means to convince her that he was greater consisted of making a comparison between the water and the well. He offered water that gave eternal life that was superior to the water of the well. In this verse he did not tell his listeners that he was greater than Moses, but told them that he was giving them bread, that was greater than the manna, and he was giving them water that is better than the water Moses got out of the rock.[779] Therefore, he is greater than Moses. That is the hidden message of this verse. He is greater because he offers nothing corruptible, but rather blessing in the participation of the holy body and blood (φθαρτὸν μὲν οὐδέν, εὐλογίαν δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν ἐν μεταλήψει τῆς ἁγίας).[780] Those who participate do not suffer corruption since his Body commingles with our bodies. He, who is by nature life, grants us eternal life,

---

[775] *In Jo.* 1.470–1.
[776] *In Jo.* 1.471.
[777] *In Jo.* 1.471–2.
[778] *In Jo.* 1.473.
[779] *In Jo.* 1.474–5.
[780] *In Jo.* 1.475.

for having become partakers of the divine nature, we shall ascend to life and incorruption (θείας τε φύσεως γεγονότες κοινωνοὶ, πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ἀναβησόμεθα).[781] The water at the well was mentioned first, then the manna, thus baptism is the introduction to the Eucharistic participation in the divine nature. Those who are baptized and do not attend church and taste the divine grace and do not partake of the Eucharist deprive themselves of eternal life.[782] Cyril introduced the manna at this stage of his exegesis to make a direct connection with the superiority of the Bread of Life to the manna in the exact same way as to the superiority of the water that he gave to the water in the well of Samaria. The superiority of the gift indicated the superiority of the giver.

Jn 6:36–37 are the final verses of Book Three. Again the theme of the divine gifts was prevailing where those who were disobedient were left without a share in the divine gifts. By the end of the book, divine gifts were not only the grace, which was the way the book began but the Eucharist was added to the understanding of what was granted to us by the Incarnation. For those who come to the Father and the Son, who is by nature savior and life-giving (ὡς σωτῆρι καὶ ζωοποιῷ κατὰ φύσιν), are partaking of the blessings (εὐλογίας) which in this case is also the Eucharist since they are partakers of the divine nature and brought back to incorruption and life, returning to the nature we maintained at the beginning.[783] Only through him and the divine grace will people not be delivered to judgment.

Cyril retained a theological and spiritual aim in writing this commentary. He was constrained by the Gospel text itself, but at the same time he followed the rhetorical rules of writing whenever applicable.[784] Where the Gospel text narrated simple events and there was no room for

---

[781] *In Jo.* 1.476.

[782] *In Jo.* 1.475–6.

[783] *In Jo.* 1.179.

[784] Kannengiesser commented on the contrast between modern exegesis and the patristic one; he writes, "As a discipline, its motivation is no longer theological, nor is its purpose to encounter in scripture the living God. It is a professional exercise of text-criticism and historical inquiry, which dispenses the interpreters from being Christian believers, and omits to address scripture as holy." Kannengiesser, *The Bible as Read in the Early Church*, 35–6. The contrast is clear, Cyril considered the biblical text as sacred and the source of spiritual interpretation in contrast to the present state of exegesis that subjects the text to the literal investigation without taking it to the second level, or at least to the scopes of scriptures.

the presentation of a theologically sophisticated theme, Cyril focused on moral and spiritual interpretations. Though it was a "simple" event, Cyril considered it most relevant to speak about the deeper and spiritual meaning of the text, for it cannot be mentioned in the Gospel had it not an aim or a message to convey. Cyril's main division of the books of the commentary followed a certain theological or spiritual theme and this marked the divisions of his text.

Having understood the main framework of Cyril's arrangement and invention, we can investigate in greater detail the words he used to introduce his spiritual interpretation followed by his use of the Old Testament.

Cyril's use of the terms: τύπος, πνευματικός, μυστήριον, αἴνιγμα, κρύπτω, σκιαγράφος, διασκοπέω, βάθυς, σημεῖον, εἰκών, σχῆμα, θεωρία, and θεωρέω

Cyril utilized spiritual interpretation to a great extent as we noted during the discussion in this chapter and the previous one, but he was clearly of the opinion that spiritual exegesisshould not be exaggerated or forced to the meaning of the text. He writes, "it is necessary not to attempt to drag around by force to spiritual interpretation that which ought to be used historically" (καὶ ὅτε μὴ δεῖ περιέλκειν πειρᾶσθαι βιαίως εἰς πνευματικὴν ἐφμηνείαν τὸ ιστορικῶς ὠφελοῦν).[785] For Cyril, the reason was that this forced interpretation might lead to confusion over what might be simply (ἁπλῶς) understood.[786] Therefore, the following terms that Cyril used to express his spiritual interpretations follow the rule that they were not forced interpretations of the text, but, rather, useful for the reader.

Cyril commented on the following Pauline verses, *for the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed* (1 Cor 15:52) and *then we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up in the clouds together with them to meet the Lord in the air; and so we will be with the Lord forever* (1 Thess 4:17) were examples of verses taken by way of resemblance of an image (ὁμοιώσεως εἰς εἰκόνα) which will not damage the force of the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν δύναμιν).[787] Therefore, any images, analogies, or other rhetorical imagery devices used in scripture, should not eliminate the simple meaning of the text and should not affect the truth and historicity of what was expressed. This principle sheds light on what was discussed in the

[785] *In Jo.* 2.154.
[786] Ibid.
[787] *In Jo.* 1.213.

previous section. Cyril always began with the literal interpretation, then delved into the spiritual aspect of the text, in turn giving more meaning to the text itself without diminishing the validity of the literary explanation that he just presented.

In spite of Cyril's great consideration of the literal meaning, he was still very conscious that Christ himself said, *I have said these things to you in figures [παροιμίαις]. The hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures* (Jn 16:25). Cyril wrote that Christ meant by a proverb or a parable (παροιμίαν) that it was an obscure (ἀμυδρόν) discourse and was not entirely visible or manifest (ἐμφανῆ) to the listeners.[788] So long as we are on this earth, the nature of the Father is revealed to us by shadows and symbols (διὰ σκιᾶς καὶ ὑποδειγμάτων) and various images and types (εἰκόνος καὶ τύπων) deduced from different phases of human life.[789] However, once the season of the Incarnation has passed and our redemption is complete we will not see in riddles, but rather the full glory will be revealed to us.[790] Cyril gave great attention to the literary aspect of the text, but we are at a stage where revelation is given to us in obscurity, and until the time has come when the full glory and complete understanding of the Godhead is achieved, we are obligated to toil in order to understand the hidden meaning of the texts. Any details in the text are not written arbitrarily. If something is written it either has the straight forward meaning that is simple and even edifying or in some cases, it has a hidden meaning that we have to investigate until the end times come and is revealed completely.

Cyril was trying to maintain the very difficult and fine balance between the literal sense and the spiritual sense. The tension in the interpreter's work always exists in order to achieve balance—in responding to the question of what extent the exegete follows the spiritual sense and what degree one abides by the literal one.[791] The following usage of a certain set of words will reveal how Cyril applied the principles that had just been brought to light.

---

[788] *In Jo.* 2.646.

[789] *In Jo.* 2.648.

[790] Ibid.

[791] Kerrigan presented three examples of the literal sense in the New Testament. One of the examples was the Baptist's coming before and after Christ. This cannot be interpreted literally because there is an αἴνιγμα, "an image from our affairs" about a person who excels. The Baptist spoke about what he hears and sees—he spoke in terms of a normal human situation." Kerrigan, *Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses*, 357.

τύπος. Type (τύπος) is the most frequently used word in Cyril's writing. According to Cyril, Christ himself understood that the teachings in the Law were a type shadowed in the writings. For example, where it is written, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, Christ amended the injunction that one should not even covet. Though the Law explicitly stated that one should not add or take away from it (Deut 4:2), Christ took away and added to the Law, that is, added coveting to the banning of adultery, therefore, changing the type into truth (μετατιθεὶς τὸ ἐν τύποις εἰς ἀλήθειαν).[792] Based on Christ's example, then, the injunctions of the New Testament were to be viewed as emendations to the Old Testament to transfer the type and shadow to truth. Thus, Cyril considered it a legitimate method of interpretation following the example of Christ.

Cyril reiterated the same meaning in Jn 7:18, *those who speak on their own seek their own glory*. Cyril explained that Christ did not speak of himself but rather he was exhorting his listeners to be obedient to what was foretold. While he only removed the unprofitable and thick shadow of the letter and persuasively transformed it into a spiritual meaning which already lay in types (μόνην τοῦ γράμματος τὴν ἀνωφελῆ καὶ παχεῖαν ἀφιστῶντα σκιὰν, μετασκευάζοντά τε πιθανῶς εἰς πνευματικὴν θεωρίαν τὰ ἐν τύποις ἔτι λανθάνοντα).[793] Cyril again asserted that what Christ was saying was nothing new, but rather it was the transformation of what was said in type to the truth.

Having established the legitimacy of the method of transforming the type to the truth, Cyril took an opportunity when interpreting Jn 14:24 to reassert that the Mosaic Law can be considered a preparatory exercise (προγύμνασμα) to the true worship in the Spirit (τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ ἐν πνεύματι λατρείας).[794] The Law did not bring anything to perfection and it was Christ who brought the shadows of things to the truth and not in types (τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἐν τύποις).[795] Cyril supported his argument by citing Paul, *this is a symbol of the present time… until the time comes to set things right* (Heb 9:9–11). Paul also recognized that what was presented in the Law was but a symbol, and, in Cyril's diction, a type, until the time comes. In Cyril's opinion, this time began with the Incarnation when the shadows of the Law were to fulfill the reality of the time.

The theme that types are taken from our daily lives is repeated in Jn 3:29 where the topic of Christ as the Bridegroom is presented. Cyril

[792] *In Jo.* 2.712.
[793] *In Jo.* 1.606.
[794] *In Jo.* 2.503.
[795] Ibid.

commented that the discourse is again taken from the likeness of our affairs (ὁμοιώσεως τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς) and this leads us to the knowledge of refined thoughts (ἄγει δὲ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεωρημάτων λεπτῶν).[796] For the type of conceived things (τύποι τῶν νοητῶν) are the ones that endure the touch of the hand (τὰ χειρὸς ἁφὴν) and the grossness of corporeal examples (σωματικῶν παραδειγμάτων) and this introduces us to the spiritual things.[797] Therefore, types (τύπος) are drawn from every day events or the materialistic things that surround us. These are the sources of inspiration or the means that inspire our understanding and illuminate our minds leading us to spiritual realities. That is why the literal meaning of the text is crucial, since it is the source of the type otherwise the spiritual meaning is forced on the text. In Cyril's opinion, this is not what is intended, since it will damage the force of the truth.

A good illustration of interpreting a historical event or an every day event into a spiritual meaning is the departure of Christ from Jerusalem (Jn 5:5,6).[798] After discussing the miracle of the paralytic, Cyril decided to end the discourse on history (ὁ τῆς ἱτορίας λὸγος)—that is, discussing the literality of the event—and transform the type of the letter to its spiritual meaning (μετασκευαστέον δὲ πὰλιν εἰς θεωρίαν πνευματικὴν τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ γράμματος τύπον).[799] Cyril interpreted the departure from Jerusalem after the killing of the sheep, referring to the Sheep Gate in Jerusalem located beside the pool of Bethesda, and preaching salvation to the Samaritans and the Galileans, as the withdrawal of Christ from the Jews after his own sacrifice on the cross. This was made even clearer when Christ explicitly told his disciples, after the resurrection, to preach to the Gentiles and to go and meet him in Galilee. His return to Jerusalem on Pentecost day, at the fulfillment of weeks, signifies in types and enigma (ἐν τύποις καὶ αἰνίγμασιν) that Christ will return in the last days to the Jews and, through faith in him, the Jews will celebrate all feasts with him.[800] It is to be observed that Cyril extracted his "type" from events in sequence. Although the interpretation was based on the event of Christ leaving Jerusalem and going to Samaria and then Galilee, the type was elongated to an extended time of events that lasted until the day of Pentecost. Nonetheless, it initiated the "type" beginning with the journey out of Jerusalem but its

[796] *In Jo.* 1.236.

[797] Ibid.

[798] In Chapter Three and in Chapter Four we discussed that Christ's departure from Jerusalem spiritually signified the departure of Grace.

[799] *In Jo.* 1. 305–6.

[800] *In Jo.* 1.306.

implications and spiritual significance were illuminated by almost the whole life span of Christ.

On another occasion (Jn 10:40–2), Christ left Jerusalem again to go beyond the Jordan to the place where the Baptist was baptizing. Cyril described this as a type clothed in riddles (τύπου αἰνίξηται) that signified that the church of the gentiles possessed the springs or fountain of baptism (τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ βαπτίσματος).[801]

Cyril considered that Christ's descent from the mountain was representative (ἀνατυποῦν) of his Second Coming from heaven.[802] This was in contrast to Christ interpreting *the field is the world* (Mt 13:38).[803] Not only events but also locations, mountains, and fields, can be types of the elevation of heaven and the lowliness of the created earth.

Another historical event that is pregnant with types is the Exodus event. What introduced the Exodus theme in the interpretation was the notion of the "sea." Once again, Christ withdrew from Jerusalem and headed to Galilee and crossed the Sea of Tiberias (Jn 6:1). The sea separated Christ from the Jews he left behind in Jerusalem. Thus, came the theme of the sea as a separator of good and evil—it separated Christ from the Jews, and separated Pharaoh from the Jews. As Pharaoh was pursuing the Israelites across the sea blindfolded by his anger, he did not realize that he was fighting God; thus, his entire army was doomed and Israel was saved. Now, as the persecutors died in the sea—that is, Pharaoh—so is the present case with the Jews who in their anger are persecuting Christ. They will share the same fate as that of Pharaoh if they do not abandon their pursuit.[804] The whole event of the pursuit and the crossing of the sea in the Exodus narrative became a type for the pursuit of the Jews to Christ. In this case it was a type that held a hidden mystery (ὁ τύπος κεκρυμμένον ἔχειν μυστήριον).[805]

The healing of the blind man in John 9 is considered a type (τύπον) of the calling of the Gentiles. It is also a type that holds a mystery (τοῦ μυστηρίου) which Cyril promised to present in brief.[806] After Christ left the temple he decided to heal the blind man and did this of his own initiative without any entreaty. God called on the Gentiles out of his good nature (ἀγαθὸς κατὰ φύσιν), for they did not call on him but he came forward and

[801] *In Jo.* 1.262.
[802] *In Jo.* 1.436.
[803] *In Jo.* 1.437.
[804] *In Jo.* 1.402–3.
[805] *In Jo.* 1.402.
[806] *In Jo.* 2.155.

showed the Gentiles his mercy. For the Gentiles and Greeks in their darkness could not call for his mercy as it was with the blind man who in his darkness did not know Christ to call for his salvation. It was indeed an act of mercy and philanthropy (ἐλέῳ καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ).[807] The healing was accomplished on the Sabbath and thereby represented a type of the last age of the present world where the Savior made his light shine on the Gentiles. For the Sabbath was the end of the week and represented the end of times.[808] The pericope of the blind man does not only represent a type, for combined with the verse, *Go, wash in the pool of Siloam* it carries a deep (βαθύς) meaning. It indicates that Christ is the creator and framer of all things (κτίστης τε καὶ δημιουργὸς τοῦ παντός).[809] In addition, this miracle carries a power of action that possesses a mystical significance (λὸγον μυστικὸν ἡ τοῦ πράγματος δύναμις).[810] It carries the mystical connection to Baptism where, through the washing, the Gentiles were able to understand the mystical significance of the Trinity.[811] The miracle is not only a type containing a deep meaning; it also carries a mystical significance. Each spiritual meaning found in the event of the healing of the blind man was very specific. The blind man, as a physical reality, is a type of the Gentiles. The creative act, is not a type since it does not refer to a physical presence of a person or object, but rather is an activity and thus carries a deep meaning. As to the action of going to the pool, this is indicated as mystical.

Cyril gave special attention to the rending of the veil of the temple. The veil shrouded the inner portion of the temple, allowing no one to enter the holy of holies except the high priest who entered with a sacrifice once a year. In the meantime, Paul wrote that the Spirit signified, by figures in type (διὰ τῶν ἐν τύποις σχημάτων), that things were not made manifest since the people kept at a distance.[812] That is, the people were distanced from the holy of holies and nothing was manifest to them, since they were not allowed to see anything because the Law was still in force placing the Jews outside the holy of holies. The precept of the conduct (πολιτείας ἡ νομική), that is, the vestibule (προαύλιόν) of the tabernacle, led to the Gospel teaching (τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς παιδεύσεώς).[813] The tabernacle was holy,

[807] *In Jo.* 2.156.
[808] Ibid.
[809] *In Jo.* 1.157.
[810] Ibid.
[811] Ibid.
[812] *In Jo.* 3.98.
[813] Ibid.

but the holy of holies was even holier. So remains the Law, those who follow it are holy, but the faith in Christ anoints and sanctifies one by the Holy Spirit. The righteousness of the faith is greater than the righteousness of the Law.[814] The veil of the temple was rent into two to signify the act of revealing the holy of holies and that those who believe in Christ are led to the most inner sanctuary. Now the knowledge of the divine mysteries was not obscure, hidden, or revealed only in types, but revealed in truth and the truth remains manifest.[815] Before the death of Christ the Law prevailed, but once Christ overcame death, he rented the veil, that is, the letter of the Law, and made the truth manifest to those who believe in him.[816] The veil was rent entirely, not in part but totally from top to bottom, to signify the full revelation of the mystery without any shadow.[817] Again, all the types presented in the Old Testament are shadows of the truth that is in Christ.

Cyril contemplated the fact that Christ was buried in a new sepulchre and conjectured that the Evangelist intentionally mentioned it to signify that it was a type that Christ's death will act as a guide to our entry into paradise.[818] Though Cyril gave such an interpretation, the words following this suggestion provided two more theological explanations for the newness of the tomb. For Cyril, the newness of the tomb conveyed to us the newness of life that was provided for us and, in addition, it took away any suggestions for anyone to say that it was another person who rose from the dead.[819] Theological consideration must be taken into account lest someone suggest that Christ did not rise from the dead. The spiritual aspect should not override the theological one.

For Cyril, the New Testament, the words, and the life of Christ revealed the meaning of the type. Christ transformed the type into truth, the shadow into reality. The Law was a type. It was not perfect and could not lead to perfection, but when it was transferred to the truth, it was amended to the revelation of Christ. The true meaning overrode the shadow.[820]

In all of the previous examples, the term τύπος was used in connection with events and themes taken from daily life. For example, the event of the

---

[814] Ibid.

[815] *In Jo.* 3.99.

[816] Ibid.

[817] *In Jo.* 3.100.

[818] *In Jo.* 3.105.

[819] *In Jo.* 3.106.

[820] As much as τύπος is a key word in Cyril's spiritual interpretation of the New Testament, Kerrigan did not indicate in his study that it was used in the Old Testament interpretation since he did not refer to it in his study.

rending of the veil of the temple is a type that now people are not kept at a distance but rather those who believe in Christ are led to the inner sanctuary. Not only events but locations such as mountains or fields can be types of the elevation of heaven and the lowliness of the created earth. The newness of the sepulchre is a type of the entry to paradise and most importantly the newness of life. In addition to events and locations, time is also used as a type. The Sabbath, is at the end of the week and is a type of the end of times.

In all of the previous examples the τύπος was never used in connection with persons. Cyril did not consider any figure in the Old Testament to represent a type of Christ. This will be even clearer when further on the figure of Moses is discussed. The Moses comparison will focus on ministry, where the ministry of Moses was meditative and stood as a type of Christ's mystical ministry.

When Cyril used type in connection with a person it is usually in negative terms such as the example of the king of Babylon who is considered a type of Satan.[821] He also used the two robbers as a type of the two condemned nations, that is, the Jews and the Greeks.[822] These two examples still illustrate the point that type is not used in connection with Christ. On the other hand, we have Clement of Alexandria who compared Isaac as a type of the Lord, the ancient righteous is a type of the new righteous, where the comparison is between Abel and Christ.[823] Clement also wrote that what is put forth in type conceals the truth.[824]

Therefore, when we compare Cyril with his predecessor Clement of Alexandria, we can easily conclude that Cyril was extremely selective in his use of the term τύπος. He intentionally avoided using the term τύπος in connection with persons, not following Clement of Alexandria's example, while at the same time he agreed with his predecessor that there was a strong connection between type (τύπος) and truth (ἀλήθεια).

πνευματικός. Another word that occurred a number of times in Cyril's writings was πνευματικός. When Cyril began his lengthy exposition of the tabernacle, he began his narration of the events by the text of Num 9:15–18 where the narrative begins with a cloud covering the tabernacle when it was

---

821 *De Adoratione*, 1(1.19E). *Lampe*, 1419.

822 *In Jo.* 3.82–83.

823 Αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Ἰσαάκ (καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν ἑτέρως ἑκλαβεῖν) τύπος ὅς ἐστι τοῦ κυρίου, παῖς μὲν ὡς υἱός. Clem. *Paed.* 1.5, PG 8.277A. ὅτι δὲ αἷμα ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν, μαρτυρεῖ τοῦ Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου τὸ αἷμα ἐντυγχάνον τῷ Θεῷ. Clem. *Paed.* 1.6, PG 8.305C.

824 τὰ φυόμενα ἐν τύπῳ προκύπτει τῶν ἀληθῶν. Clem. *Str.* 1.7, PG 8.732B.

set up. Cyril commented that the Israelites were commanded to begin their journey with the journey of the cloud and to halt when the cloud does not journey any more. Cyril then informed his readers that the discourse will be transferred from the narrative to the spiritual interpretation (τῆς ἱστορίας ὁ λόγος ἐπὶ τὸ πνευματικόν).[825] He then went into a detailed account to explain this transformation. Again, Cyril highlighted his ideas of exegesis when he wrote that scriptures cannot be interested in the clouds, or be interested in pure cosmological events, rather these events must transfer to the reader a spiritual experience.[826]

In Cyril's lengthy treatment of the Sabbath, he insisted that Christ can never transgress the Law. He was the promulgator of the Law and he could transform it as he wills, he eliminated the overlying shadow to reveal the truth of the Law and transform the dark and thick sense to spiritual contemplation (εἰς πνευματικὴν μεταβάλλοιτο θεωρίαν τὰ παχύτερόν).[827] The spiritual sense gives a new meaning to what was delivered of old in darkness and thickness.

Cyril's treatise on circumcision also contained the aim of transforming the letter to a spiritual meaning. He spoke about the circumcision of the Spirit (ἡ ἐν πνεύματι περιτομὴ) and noted that what is done in the flesh is a symbol (σύμβολον).[828] Three out of the five treatises on the Old Testament presented in *The commentary on the Gospel of John* were showcased with the aim to transform and comprehend the event in a spiritual meaning.[829]

The tenth chapter of the Gospel of John speaks about Christ being the good shepherd. It also speaks about the sheep who will not listen to the thieves and robbers who enter the sheepfold stealthily. However, those sheep who come to Christ, do not enter stealthily but from the door

---

[825] *In Jo.* 1.564.

[826] This could be contrasted with Philo's great interest in interpreting all events, especially that of the Exodus only from the cosmological perspective to prove the harmony of the Jewish Law with the universe and that the promulgator of the Law is the creator of the universe. A good example for such an effort on behalf of Philo can be traced in, Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, The Loeb Classical Library, vol. 6 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984).

[827] *In Jo.* 1.617–8.

[828] *In Jo.* 1.631.

[829] The five Old Testament treatises found in the Johannine commentary are, Moses, the manna, the tabernacle, Sabbath, and circumcision. Cyril used for the tabernacle, Sabbath, and circumcision the term πνευματικός in the interpretation of each of these discourses.

because *I am the gate* and they go straight to the owner of the sheepfold for *I am the good shepherd* (Jn 10:9,11). Cyril commented that Christ molded the form of the discourse (διαπλάττει τοῦ λόγου τὸ σχῆμα) from the narrative form (ἐξ ἱστορίας) to spiritual contemplation (θεωρίαν πνευματικὴν).[830] The ἱστορία is simple. Those who enter unlawfully indicate by their behavior that they are committing an unlawful act, while those who enter by the door are welcomed by the lord of the sheep and he knows them and opens the door for them. This is the type of the narrative (τῆς ἱστορίας ὁ τύπος).[831] But as to our spiritual profit (ὠφέλειαν πνευματικὴν), those who take leadership without having permission to enter from the door will perish because they transgressed the divine judgment (κρῖμα τὸ θεῖον).[832] Nevertheless, those who are allotted leadership by God, and come forth to it through Christ, will govern, through the help of grace, the most sacred sheepfold. They will be greatly rewarded, since their aim is to benefit the fold.[833] This is a parable of the good shepherd and transforming the type of the sheep to the shepherds of the church is not unique. However, to focus on those who stealthily enter the fold is most probably dictated by the situation of the pervasiveness of the Arians for some time in leadership positions. Also, it is part of the polemics against heretics to inform them, that even if they have a leadership position, judgment of the Lord will take place. The whole text is against heresy, and when he finds an opportunity to attack those who conduct the heresy—though in this case never named—Cyril used a double-edged sword against his opponents. Another aspect of the spiritual exegesiswas that it is also an attack on the Jewish leadership at the time of Christ who were eliminated from leading the fold because of their refusal of Christ's message.

The true vine is another example where Cyril took advantage of a certain parable and transformed it to a spiritual interpretation and used it to attack the Jewish leadership. He examined the parable spiritually (πνευματικῶς).[834] In Cyril's opinion, Christ must have wanted to convey other meanings from the verse *He removes every branch in me that does not bear any fruit. Every branch that bears fruit he prunes it to make it bear more fruit* (Jn 15:2). Cyril wrote that the branch that is removed from the fellowship with Christ and consequently severed from the Father referred to the Jewish people. Those who were not cut off were the Jewish people who believed.

---

[830] *In Jo.* 2.216.
[831] Ibid.
[832] *In Jo.* 2.216–7.
[833] *In Jo.* 2.217.
[834] *In Jo.* 1.551.

The believers included Gentile converts. The Holy Spirit purified both,[835] but the Holy Spirit sanctified each differently. The Jewish converts were sanctified by not accepting the Law to be what guided their lives, and the Gentiles were purified from the worship of idols and following ignorant customs.[836] Cyril used this parable to serve his polemics against the Jewish leadership who refused Christ and were incapable of bearing fruit and thus will be cut off the vine. Cyril used the word πνευματικός when he was dealing with a narrative—ἱστορία—in which he thought a spiritual interpretation was beneficial to the reader because the simple meaning did not convey what was really meant and did not convey other possible meanings.

When Cyril used the parables of the Good Shepherd and that of the true vine to serve his polemics, he most probably considered this to be beneficial to his readers as well. In Cyril's opinion, what could have been more beneficial than preserving the orthodox faith of his readers. This coincides with the aim of a dogmatic exegetical work, to preserve the orthodox faith.

In general, the use of πνευματικός in the meaning of a mystical or spiritual sense of scripture was extremely common especially in the Alexandrian Church. Origen was the first to use it in this sense in *On First Principle* where Origen considered that all divine scripture had spiritual meaning.[837] Didymus the Blind also spoke of the "mystical and spiritual meaning of scripture" in Ps 1:3.[838] Actually, the spiritual meaning of scripture originated with Origen and was used only by Didymus the Blind and Cyril. Cyril was following the Alexandrian tradition.

μυστήριον. Cyril used the term μυστήριον more than once. When Christ said *where I am you cannot come* (Jn 7:34) these words, in Cyril's opinion, were concealed in mystery (μυστήριον).[839] The simple meaning would be that Christ was beyond the grasp of the Jewish leaders since he was beside the Father. The keyword that leads us to understand the verse is the word 'seek' (ζητοῦσιν)[840] for *you will search [ζητήσετέ] for me, but you will not find me* (Jn 7:34) because they could not go where he was going. For those who seek him, and those who follow him will worship him in heaven and will be with him. Those who do not seek him will be deprived of the divine

[835] Ibid.
[836] *In Jo.* 1.552.
[837] *De Principiis* 4.3.5. PG 2.385B.
[838] PG 14.313C
[839] *In Jo.* 1.682.
[840] Ibid.

glory.[841] The mystery is in the understanding that it is not physical inability to reach him, but rather the spiritual deprivation from the divine glory that will not enable the Jewish leaders to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you; abide in my love. If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love (Jn 15:9–10) are verses that Cyril regarded as μυστήρια and needed to be considered with an eye of understanding (τῷ τῆς διανοίας ὀφθαλμῷ).[842] This text has a deep (βαθὺς) meaning and puts before the readers the significance of the Incarnation (σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας).[843] This reveals to us that God the Father loved the Son and the Son loves us with the same love by which he is loved. The Son explained that the means by which we would be loved, with that same love, is by abiding by his commandments. This really meant that Christ set himself as a type (τύπον) of the exalted condition (τῆς εὐγοῦς πολιτείας) of humanity[844] where he accepted our poverty and our condition and was under the Law because of his Incarnation. He did this to be a guide and pattern in order for us to recover our original state. The mystery is revealed once we understand the meaning of the Incarnation in light of Phil 2:7–9 and understand that the Son took our condition and set himself as a pattern for us.

In these two examples, μυστήριον was used in the sense of a secret conveyed to the readers. This meaning was used by many in this sense and did not represent the language of a specific school of scriptural or theological thought.

<u>αἴνιγμα</u>. Cyril occasionally used the word αἴνιγμα in his exegesis. *You will search for me, but you will not find me; and where I am, you cannot come* (Jn 7:34) is a verse that Cyril divided into two parts and each part was considered a riddle (αἴνιγμα). The first part of the verse, when interpreted by its obvious meaning is simple but it contains a hidden αἴνιγμα within it. The simple meaning is that he who has ascended into heaven cannot be taken by them (αὐτοῖς ἁλώσιμον).[845] However, the truer meaning is that which is shown in riddles or enigmatically (τὸ δὲ ἀληθέστερόν τε καὶ αἰνιγματωδῶς ὑποδηλούμενον).[846] The true meaning is that Christ was sent to give life and take away the death that has overcome us because of our transgression.

[841] Ibid.
[842] *In Jo.* 2.568.
[843] Ibid.
[844] Ibid.
[845] *In Jo.* 1.680.
[846] Ibid.

Christ came to implant the divine and heavenly light in those who are in darkness (παραγέγονα τοῖς ἐν σκότει τὸ θεῖον ἐνθήων καὶ οὐράνιον φῶς).[847] For he came to preach the Gospel to the poor and those who are in captivity (referring to Is 61:1,2). Nevertheless, those who do not repent and accept the Gospel message and prefer to live in darkness, will not be able to enjoy the heavenly light. Once they refuse Christ they will not be able to reach him again and thus *You will search for me, but you will not find me*. As to the second half of the verse, which also conceals a deep mystery which we have referred to under μυστήριον where it meant the deprivation from the divine glory. At the end of the verse Cyril concluded that it is true the Lord will say enigmatically (αἰνιγματι) to the Jews *where I am, you cannot come*.[848] Thus, Jn 7:34 is a verse that conveys a μυστήριον in αἴνιγμα.

The parable of the good shepherd contains a certain αἴνιγμα expressed within it. Cyril wrote that Christ introduced the parable of the good shepherd to fight the inner thoughts of the Pharisees. The setting of the parable came after Christ healed a blind man who was driven out of the synagogue by the Pharisees. After Christ found the blind man and after he acknowledged that Christ is the Son of Man, Christ said that he came into this world for judgment, *so that those who do not see may see, and those who do see may become blind* (Jn 9:39). Some of the Pharisees overheard him and asked if it was they, the Pharisees, who were accused of being blind. In answer to their question, Christ pronounced the parable of the good shepherd and Cyril concluded that the answer contains a certain riddle or αἴνιγμα. If Christ answered the Pharisees' question and asserted that they were blind, Christ would have been accused of reviling the authority of the synagogue and that of God. Therefore, Cyril suggested that Christ answered them to fight their thoughts and thus introduced the parable (παραβολὴν) enigmatically (ἐν αἰνιγμασιν) implying the answer.[849] The answer was that on account of their arrogance they did not firmly hold their leadership (καθηγεῖσθαι).[850] This was also to declare that leadership was given only to those who were called to it. This was the αἴνιγμα in the parable. Christ answered the Pharisees who asked him if he was accusing them of blindness, and he answered enigmatically that they would not keep their leadership posts any longer since leadership would be held by those who are granted this position.

---

[847] Ibid.
[848] *In Jo.* 1.684.
[849] *In Jo.* 2.209.
[850] Ibid.

Cyril explained that when the Jewish leaders heard what Christ preached and that what he demanded of them was beyond and above the Law, the Jewish leaders felt that their way of life was threatened. Cyril continued that these leaders did not understand that the Law was pointed out in darkness (διὰ σκιᾶς) and enigmatically (αἰνιγμάτων) to profit its hearers.[851] As the sunlight is useless to those who cannot see, and as healthy food is useless to those in bad health, so was Christ to those who heard him since they refused to be saved.[852]

Cyril used the term αἴνιγμα to refer to sayings or pronouncements that were said in riddles and which were not undertstood by their hearers. The message is conveyed sometimes in an intentionally covert manner since the hearers were either unwilling to accept it or because the mystery within it was best expressed in this form.[853]

Cyril used αἴνιγμα to mean a hidden meaning or mystery and this meaning has been used by many early Christian writers. Cyril uniquely used αἴνιγμα to reflect the audience's readiness.

κρύπτω. κρύπτω was also used to reveal a hidden meaning but in a way different from that of αἴνιγμα. Cyril wrote that the multitudes that followed Christ after they observed his miracles were not only spectators who loved

---

[851] *In Jo.* 3.28.

[852] *In Jo.* 3.28–9.

[853] Kerrigan discussed Cyril's use of αἴνιγμα in the Old Testament. In Kerrigan's opinion Cyril used αἴνιγμα together with παραβολή and παράδειγμα synonymously. Kerrigan explains that "παραβολή and παράδειγμα are species of the figure that is styled ὁμοίωσις.… ὁμοίωσις therefore corresponds to the simile of English rhetoric; it is a simple comparison in which two realities are juxtaposed. In the παράδειγμα one of these realities is an event of the past, which is compared with some present event, with a view to persuading or dissuading one from a determined course of action." Kerrigan explained that παράδειγμα invokes two real events, while παραβολή introduces fictitious things. Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 61–2. If Kerrigan's definition of παράδειγμα is valid, then Cyril's use of that term in the Old Testament exegesis is that of αἴνιγμα in the New Testament where a real event of old, is transformed to understand the truth of an event of the New Testament. Kerrigan defines αἴνιγμα according to Greek rhetoric as "a figure of speech which is obscure both in expression and meaning." Ibid., 63. We understand from these observations that Kerrigan was comparing the Greek rhetorical use of the words with that of Cyril's. The question would then be, how far did Cyril follow the rhetorical meanings of these terms, or did he accommodate the meaning of these terms to the biblical use? O'Keefe mentioned in his research that the term αἴνιγμα was mentioned only once in Cyril's interpretation of the Book of Malachi. O'Keefe, *Interpreting the Angel*, 198.

watching (φιλοθεάμονες) miracles but rather they were admiring miracles done on the sick.[854] This gives us an insight of how different the multitudes were from the Jewish leaders who were following him out of jealousy. For Cyril this revealed a concealed interpretation (εἰρημένοις ἐγκεκρύφθαι).[855] Jn 6:2–4 just mentions the multitudes following Christ while he did his miracles, but Cyril saw the concealed interpretation in the fact that the following crowds were admirers and not people waiting to threaten the wonderworker with an accusation.

Christ told the Jews who followed him that if they believed in him, they would abide in his commandments and truly become his disciples (Jn 8:30). Thus, the obvious meaning is that if they follow his commandments they were going to be his disciples. However, the hidden meaning (κεκρυμμένον) is that he is trying to withdraw them from the Mosaic teachings and remove them from adhering to the letter since the Law was spoken in type (ἐν τύπῳ λαληθεῖσί) in comparison to the clear words of the Gospel.[856] Therefore, κρύπτω reveals the double entendre or the non-obvious meaning in a statement or the actions of a person or a group of persons. It is contemplating on the further meaning of a certain situation. This is different from αἴνιγμα where the concealed meaning is intended.

In general, κρύπτω was not frequently used by Christian writers, though, in contrast, Cyril used the term more often than other writers in his writings primarily in connection with the Old Testament.[857] The distinctive use by Cyril is that κρύπτω reveals the non-obvious meaning. It is a meaning that might not be necessary but when explained gives a deeper meaning to the interpretations.

σκιαγράφος. Another word that was used only once in Cyril's commentary was σκιαγράφος which is a type of sketching and drawing in light and shade. The term was used in commenting on Ex 30:12,13 where the children of Israel are ordered to give a ransom of half of a didrachm for their souls.[858] Cyril explained that this shadowed Christ himself (ἐσκιαγραγεῖτο).[859] Cyril—with his use of this word—was insinuating in his exegesis that the didracham and the double drachma represented Christ, not

---

[854] *In Jo.* 1.405.

[855] Ibid.

[856] Ibid.

[857] *De Adoratione*, 3, PG 1.82A. *Glaphyra Dt.*, PG 1.425C. *Lampe*, 780.

[858] This pericope was discussed in Chapter Two under "The Oneness of the Trinity."

[859] *In Jo.* 1.450.

in total shadow nor in a clear type, but rather in a sketch that is visible and comprehensible in the contrast of both the shadow and the light.

Σκιαγράφος was not used by early Christian writers but rather more by secular ones. Cyril was the only Christian writer to appropriate this term to convey the exegetical meaning of looking at a verse in a different way.

διασκοπέω. Cyril used another word διασκοπέω to convey a similar meaning to that of κρύπτω. Cyril wrote that he was going to pay close attention to Jn 15: 11 *I have said these things to you so that my joy may be in you, and that your joy may be complete* since he believes Christ wanted to deliver a message through this verse. Cyril thus wrote that we have to look at the verse from a different way (διασκέψασθαι).[860] Other than the obvious meaning, Cyril posed the following question: does it mean that Christ was a man like us, only without sin, ready to undergo all the suffering with joy? Rather, it means that Christ considered the fulfilling of the Father's will and providing salvation to all those who come to him as his pleasure and joy.[861] Therefore, διασκοπέω conveyed the meaning that the interpreter was looking at a verse or passage in a different way in comparison to κρύπτω where the meaning is in the verse but needs to be revealed and not concealed.

βαθύς. Βαθύς was also used to denote a deeper meaning to the text. Cyril commented that there must be a deeper (βαθύς) meaning to Christ's order to the blind man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam (Jn 9:6,7). The deeper meaning was that Christ who gave the power to the withered eye to be vivified was the one who formed us at the beginning. The deep meaning of the miracle was to certify that Christ was the creator. Βαθύς did not convey a hidden or enigmatic meaning but the word was used in a very similar way to what διασκοπέω means. Βαθύς was frequently used in the Johannine commentary text.

The use of βαθύς to indicate the deeper or spiritual and profound sense of scripture was first used by Origen. In Homily 19 on Jeremiah, Origen acknowledged that he did not know the deep thought of this pericope.[862] Cyril, together with any other early Christian writers used the true βαθύς following Origen's footsteps.

σημεῖον. Σημεῖον was also frequently used in the Cyrillian vocabulary. When the soldiers came to arrest Christ in the garden he announced his presence and once he uttered the words *I am he, they stepped back and fell to the*

---

860 *In Jo.* 2.572.

861 *In Jo.* 2.573.

862 τῆς περικοπῆς ... τὸ νόημα τὸ βαθύς. PG 13.485C.

ground (Jn 18:6). Cyril commented that the falling to the ground was a sign (σημεῖον) of the crouching down of the nations (τοῦ ἔθνους καταπτώσεως).[863] The falling down and humbling of nations was, according to Cyril, prophesied by Jeremiah who wrote, *Hear this word that I take up over you in lamentations, O house of Israel: Fallen, no more to rise* (Am 5:1–2).[864] Cyril explained that that which happened is an εἰκών that indicates that anyone who opposes Christ is doomed to utter humiliation.[865] Σημεῖον was used to give meaning to an act that occurred and that meaning might contain a beneficial spiritual message.

Christ's clothes (ἱματίοις) were divided into four portions but his tunic (χιτών) was without seam woven from top to bottom (Jn 19:23). Cyril interpreted this to be a mystical sign (σημεῖον μυστικῆς) for the salvation of the four quarters of the world.[866] The four quarters of the world divided among themselves the clothes of the Word, that is, his body. Though the Only-Begotten is divided into pieces and sanctifies the soul and the body of every person, yet he is also one so is the Church undivided. Christ cannot be divided.[867]

The same pattern of interpretation was followed in the example of the crucifixion of Christ among the two robbers. The two robbers signify (σημεῖον) the two nations—the children of Israel and the Gentiles—who will come together to be close to Christ.[868] The two robbers are a type of the two nations who are condemned. The Jews were condemned by the Law and the Greeks by their idolatry.[869] In addition, the two robbers signify (σημαίνει) the two nations dying with Christ and abandoning worldly pleasures and refusing to live in the flesh.[870] Cyril added that the simile (εἰκόνος) did not falsify the fact nor the event itself. The sign does not mean that the event or fact is not true. The previous examples present the significance of two events that signified a theological and spiritual meaning beyond the simple meaning.

---

[863] *In Jo.* 3.19.

[864] Cyril attributed the verse to Jeremiah though it is actually found in Amos. The false attribution of a verse to another writer was likely due to memory error and indicated the extraordinary erudition of the early church writers who memorized scripture so commendably.

[865] *In Jo.* 3.19.

[866] *In Jo.* 3.88.

[867] Ibid.

[868] *In Jo.* 3.82.

[869] *In Jo.* 3.82–3.

[870] *In Jo.* 3.83.

Cyril used the term σημεῖον in the strict sense of "symbol." This is in contrast to Origen who suggested that a σημεῖον must also be a τέρας where something extraordinary happened to evoke the faith.[871] Athanasius used σημεῖον in the sense of "miracle" in his *Vita Antonii*.[872] The Gospel of John denoted σημεῖον to specifically mean a miracle.[873] Though Cyril was working on the Johannine Gospel and is part of the Alexandrian tradition, it is clear that he deliberately restricted his use of the term σημεῖον to mean, "symbol."

εἰκών. In addition to the previous example under σημεῖον we can demonstrate another example of how Cyril used the word εἰκών in his exegesis of Jn 19:32–37. The pericope described the death of Christ on the cross and a spear piercing his side followed by a flow of blood and water from the wound in his side. The blood and water in Cyril's interpretation was an εἰκών of the Eucharist (τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας) and the holy baptism (τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος).[874] The simile was directly represented without much elaboration or explanation from Cyril. It was a clear εἰκών that did not need, in this case—even in Cyril's elaborate style of writing—further explanation. The use of εἰκών to represent sacramental notions became so common in the church by the time of Cyril that it became common knowledge that did not need further elaboration.[875]

σχῆμα. Cyril gave a unique interpretation of the garden of Gethsemane. The garden was a figure (σχῆμα) of or means the paradise of old (τοῦ ἀρχαίου παραδείσου).[876] In paradise the beginning of troubles that affected humanity began, and in a garden the suffering of Christ began. It was the place where humanity would regain its ancient condition (τὸ ἀρχαῖον).[877] Cyril considered the Gethsemane garden as a figure of the old

---

[871] *Lampe*, 1231.

[872] PG 26.925B.

[873] The Gospel of John is sometimes named the "Gospel of Signs" since the word σημεῖον is used to mean "miracle" in the following verses: Jn 2:11, 18, 23; 3:2; 4:48, 54; 6:2, 14, 26, 30; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47; 12:18, 37; 20:30.

[874] *In Jo.* 3.103.

[875] *Lampe*, 412.7b. Lampe cited so many early Christian writers who used εἰκών in this sense proving Cyril's unconcern with further elaboration.

[876] *In Jo.* 3.15.

[877] Ibid. R. Brown mentioned that Cyril and Aquinas were the only two who alluded to the garden as a σχῆμα of paradise. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 806. But most probably Cyril was the originator of the idea since Cyril was historically prior to Aquinas. Refer to Bovon for Aquinas' dependence on Cyril.

one. In the first garden, humanity lost its condition and in the second the beginning of regaining this condition occurred. In addition to the unique interpretation, no other writer used the term σχῆμα in this sense of "meaning, interpretation."[878] Therefore, Cyril used this term in a very distinct manner.

θεωρία, θεωρέω. θεωρία and θεωρέω are two words that were used by Cyril extensively. Since we cited many uses of the term we will suffice to reference to the previous discussion of the term.[879]

Cyril's use of the terms just discussed indicates that he was extremely meticulous and particular in his use of words. In addition, he allocated to each word a special interpretative meaning, and he hardly interchanged the use of words. A common exegetical term such as τύπος was used in a very specific sense of comparison. The figure of Christ was never used in any of his types though this was a common practice among his predecessors as well as his contemporaries. Cyril also uniquely appropriated διασκοπέω as an exegetical term while at the same time restricted his use of σχῆμα where the common usage of the term coincided with his exegetical one. In

---

François Bovon, "From St. Luke to St. Thomas by the Way of St. Cyril," in *Studies in Early Christianity* (Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005).

[878] *Lampe*, 1359. In the following two examples Cyril used the term σχῆμα in its strict linguistic sense to indicate "meaning." *In Jo.* 1.647 Cyril wrote, σχῆμα γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ περιτέθειται βαθύ, for a deep meaning lies within this word. Also *In Jo.* 1.688, Cyril writes, οὐδὲ ἀληθῶς τῆς ἑορτῆς ἐν ἐκίνοις ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα, εἴη δ' ἂν μᾶλλον πραγμάτων σύμβολα νοητῶν, ἅ δοθήσεται τοῖς εὐσεβοῦσι διὰ Χριστοῦ, neither is the true meaning of the feast in these things, but rather is the symbol of intellectual or spiritual things which shall be given to the pious through Christ. In both of these examples Cyril used σχῆμα in its strict sense of "meaning." In contrast to the above example, where it is used to serve an exegetical purpose.

[879] Refer to the discussion of *In Jo.* 1.606; 1.236; 1.305–6; 2.216. In addition there was a very detailed study regarding the use of the term θεωρία in the works of Cyril of Alexandria in general, not only that of the Johannine commentary. Francis Joseph Houdek, "Contemplation in the Life and Works of Saint Cyril of Alexandria" (Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1979). Houdek suggested that Cyril used θεωρία in a twofold sense. He used it to represent the act of contemplation and the other meaning is that it "denotes the hidden mystery of Scripture which could be only apprehended by the act of contemplation (θεωρία)." Ibid., 278. This is very similar to what has been concluded in this research. Houdek did not limit his investigation to exegetical works of Cyril but also the polemical ones. Kerrigan gave great attention to θεωρία in his study. Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 116–122. Due to Houdek's detailed study together with that of Kerrigan, this study will refer the reader to their research.

addition, he was very careful to avoid any miraculous connotation to the term σημεῖον. It is very noteworthy to mention that Cyril never used the word ἀλληγορέω or ἀλληγορὶα.[880] For Cyril, scriptures did not describe one

[880] Kerrigan referred to a "German scholar, Rücker who remarked that St. Cyril indulged in "allegorizing" explanations to a far less extent in his *Commentary on St. Luke*, than in his *Commentaries on the Old Testament* and *the Gospel of St. John*." He further commented that the "Alexandrian School" has a "constant preoccupation with the divinity rather than the humanity when treating the dual nature of Christ." Kerrigan, *Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses*, 367–8. It is clear that this comment comes from a generalized theory that the Alexandrians are "allegorical" in their interpretations which, in the case of Cyril, is hard to prove. Reuther was astute to clarify the difference between allegory and type. She writes, "Allegory moves from the concrete to the abstract, from the historical to the timeless and eternal, whereas typology remains on the historical level, using past experiences as types of present experiences, even though it commonly moves from the 'bodily' or what Gregory calls the *somatikos* level to the inner level (*pneumatikos*)." She explained further that allegory transforms past events into symbols of timeless truth. Reuther, *Gregory of Nazianzus as Rhetor*, 105. This distinction between allegory and type makes it clear that Cyril did not use allegory, since we did not find in any example a timeless symbolic transposition. Any allegory in Cyril would be the exception not the norm. Thus, the general labeling of the Alexandrian school as allegorical can be very misleading. In addition, to attribute all dogmatic differences merely to the hypothetical division of the two schools—the Alexandrian and the Antiochene—to two competing schools of interpretation and, thus, the cause of many of the theological problems is a theory that recently has undergone serious revision. However, the vocabulary of this theory is in so many scholarly works that it will take a long time to achieve a change. Mckinion summarizes the works of some scholars and writes that Torrance and F. Young have "called into question the traditional categories of "literal," "typological," and "allegorical" as descriptions of exegetical systems." McKinion, 22. F. Young made an interesting comment on allegory. She writes, "Allegory in its rhetorical usage was a figure of speech among other figures of speech: it was to speak so as to imply something other than what is said, and included irony. Often to interpret something allegorically was simply to recognise metaphor rather than taking something very woodenly according to the letter. All language signified, and as sign was symbolic. The crucial question was what it symbolised or referred to." F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 120. Also refer to H. A. Blair, "Allegory, Typology and Archetypes," *Studia Patristica* 17/1 (1982): 263–8. Kerrigan agreed that the term ἀλληγορία was seldom used in Cyril's Old Testament interpretation and he cites only two references (PG 69.140A; 77.484D) of which he knows that Cyril used the term. Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 115. To my knowledge he did not use the term ἀλληγορία even once in his *Commentary on John*. Kerrigan quoted Danieléou as admitting that "the tendency

thing using the image of another; rather, the Old Testament was a type of the truth that is unveiled in the New Testament. It is discovering the transformation of the type to the truth. It is not an abstract image to convey another image or message, but rather the type itself holds truth, and transformation does not diminish or destroy the type. The theory that the Alexandrian school of interpretation is allegorical does not hold in the case of Cyril nor is the claim that the Alexandrian School is preoccupied with the divinity rather than the humanity of the person of Christ.

Cyril's use of the Old Testament Themes in his New Testament Interpretation

Cyril's exposition of the New Testament depended heavily on the use of the Old Testament. In summation of what was discussed thus far, Cyril used the Old Testament as reference for proof of his argument. In his polemics against the heretics, taking the example of his defense against Origen, he used the Old Testament persons as witnesses of credible characters to prove his point. His witness characters were Isaiah, Abraham, Hannah, Hezekiah, and Jeremiah through which he proved the invalidity of having bodies as a punishment for our sins. His second use of the Old Testament was a witness of literary authority, substituting for the ancient traditional witness of Homer and other reputable Greek poets and philosophers.[881] The third use of the Old Testament was in his dogmatic arguments where we take the example of his proof that the Son is God from God, that is, the Son is equally divine. When Cyril commented on Jn 8:24 *for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he*, he explained that if the Son maintains the ability to redeem us, then he is the Savior. The Son is also light, healer, forgiver of sins, shepherd, messenger of the covenant, sacrifice, and law.

---

to discover spiritual sense in every text of Scripture is contrary to true typology, 'which regards as figures of the New Testament only such episodes as sketch in broad outline the deeds that Christ will accomplish in their fullness.' From typology, thus understood, Père Daniélou distinguishes allegory, which, far from being a sense of Scripture, is but Christian philosophy and ethics presented in imagery borrowed from the Bible." Quoted in Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 447–8. Cyril did not have any notions to philosophize, maybe that is why allegory was not to his taste.

[881] The detailed discussion of these conclusions is in Chapter Three under the subtitle "Argumentation with Heretics."

Through the discussion of this pericope we observed that all the titles used to prove the divinity of the Son are Old Testament titles.[882]

The last two means of use of the Old Testament in Cyril's exegesis of the New Testament was his use of some Old Testament motifs and pericopes to prove the transference of the type in the Old Testament to the truth as revealed in the New Testament. The last section in this chapter revealed that through understanding how Cyril used his spiritual exegetical terms to indicate such a practice. In addition, there was one more use of the Old Testament to the same objective, and this was Cyril's dedication of full treatise to the following five motifs Moses, Manna, the Tabernacle,[883] the Sabbath,[884] and circumcision.[885] These treatises were an elaborate means that Cyril used to transform the type of the Old Testament into the truth of

---

[882] Jn 8:24 was discussed in detail in Chapter Two under the subtitle, "The Son."

[883] *In Jo.* 1.562–578. Book Four Chapter Four. The heading of the chapter reads, "That a type of Christ was in the holy Tabernacle which led the people in the wilderness, and that the ark was in it and the lamp and the alter, and the incense signifying Christ himself" *In Jo.* 1.562. Cyril's heading indicates the trajectory of the whole chapter. Cyril also writes that "the historical discourse (will be transferred to) the spiritual one" (τῆς ἱστορίας ὁ λόγος ἐπὶ τὸ πνευματικόν). *In Jo.* 1.564. The heading shows his aim (σκοπός) in the discourse about the tabernacle and he indicates his method, that is of transferring the ἱστορίας to πνευματικόν, very clearly. Holder writes that "both Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria developed the christological sense, finding in the tabernacle intimations of the union of human and divine natures in Christ." Arthur Holder, "The Mosaic Tabernacle in Early Christian Exegesis," *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993): 104. Holder also writes that Cyril is the only exegete "whose exposition of the tabernacle degenerated into full-blown anti-Jewish polemic." Ibid., 106. As discussed in Chapter Two of this research if such treatises are taken out of context, they can be interpreted as anti-Jewish but in context they are to be interpreted that the Jewish leaders could not understand the truth of the type. Kerrigan made a comparative study of Cyril's interpretation of the Tabernacle with that of Philo, Josephus, Pseudo-Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Pseudo-Athanasius, Jerome, Pseudo-Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodoret of Cyrus. Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria Interpreter of the Old Testament*, 390–419. Cyril wrote another discourse on the tabernacle in *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate* 9–11, PG 68:587–782.

[884] *In Jo.* 1.615–627. (Book IV Chapter VI) The heading of the chapter reads, "a discourse (λόγος) concerning the rest of the Sabbath, manifoldly showing what is significant."

[885] *In Jo.* 1.628–644. (Book IV Chapter VII) Liebaert inaccurately described the five treatises as "allegorical" treatises. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique*, 73. As the last section concluded that Cyril did not use the term "allegory" in his exegesis.

the New Testament where Christ is the center figure. Following is a detailed discussion of the two motifs, that of Moses and Manna, taken as an example to explain Cyril's way to incur the transformation of the type into truth.

Moses.[886] The chapter heading reads "That Moses signified (ἐσήμαινεν) the coming of the Savior. From Deuteronomy concerning Christ."[887] The focus of the treaty is on Deut 18:15–19. Cyril considered the book of Deuteronomy as a kind of repetition (ἐπανάληψίν) and summation of the arguments (ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν) of the Mosaic Law and Cyril added that because of this he will not be able to extract a type (τύπον) or simile (εἰκόνα) of the legal priesthood (νομικῆς ἱερουγίας).[888] The Deuteronomy passage conveys, in Cyril's understanding, the mystery of Christ (ἡμῖν τὸ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ λαλεῖται μυστήριον). This mystery is present through subtle contemplation of the likeness of Moses (ἐξ ὁμοιότητος τῆς κατὰ Μωυσέα διὰ λεπτοτάτης θεωρίας).[889] The passage from Deuteronomy conveys to us that the Israelites could not bear to hear the voice of the Lord or to see the great fire lest they should die. Therefore, God spoke through a mediator, that is, Moses, since the elders or assembly or synagogue of the Jews could not handle to be in a mediative role because these things were above their power. Thus, the ministry and mediation of Moses was instituted to handle the infirmity of the Jewish assembly who could not handle the power and decrees of the Lord. Now that Cyril clarified the type, he proceeded to transfer the type to the truth (μεταλήψῃ δὲ πάλιν τὸν τύπον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν).[890] Therefore, the image of mediation (τὴν τῆς μεσιτείας

---

[886] *In Jo.* 1.391–6. (Book III Chapter III). Cyril wrote another exposition on Moses in the *Glaphyra* in Exod. 1.2–3. PG 69.386C–392B. This section will be limited to the Johannine text. McGuckin mentioned that in the introduction of the Glaphyra at the beginning of the treatise about Moses, Cyril "marks out three focal points of interest in regard to the Moses-type, around which he organises most of his material in the book." John McGuckin, "Moses and the 'Mystery of Christ' in St. Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis," *Coptic Church Review* 21 (2000): 30. This side comment indicates the system of "invention" and "arrangement" in Cyril's writings where he sets his thesis and begins to prove it. Cyril also referred to Moses with his polemics against Nestorius in *ACO* I,1,6,39.4–48.31.

[887] *In Jo.* 1.391.

[888] Ibid. Cyril did not elaborate to explain more the connection between the summary of the Law and his inability to find types and similes. But at least, we can understand that he thought that he was expected to find such contemplations in this text.

[889] Ibid.

[890] *In Jo.* 1.392.

εἰκόνα) presented by Cyril was that Moses is considered a type (τύπος) of Christ ministering to the children of Israel. The distinction was that Moses' ministry was mediative while that of Christ was free and more mystical (μυστικωτέρα).[891]

Another distinction in the type of Moses is that Christ was a Lawgiver while Moses was a deliverer of the Law. When Moses writes,[892] *I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet who shall speak to them everything that I command* (Deut 18:18) it was Christ who was alluded to since he became flesh making himself like us.[893] The text Cyril utilized reads the verse *like me* upon which he continues his interpretation that the likeness between the prophet that will be raised is that both, the prophet and God, are lawgivers. The proof that the prophet mentioned in the verse is a Lawgiver is in the following verse, *you have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you* ….(Mt 5:27) thus both God and Christ are lawgivers. If they believed Moses, they would have believed Christ concerning whom all this prophecy is said.[894]

Cyril concluded his treatise on Moses by stating that the writings of Moses introduce a kind of instruction, for through them the typical form of the mystery of Christ is revealed (οὐκοῦν τὰ μὲν Μωυσέως γράμματα, παιδαγωγίαν τινὰ καὶ τὸν διὰ τύπου σχηματισμὸν τῶν ἐπὶ Χριστῷ

---

[891] *In Jo.* 1.393. McGuckin writes, "Christ, for Cyril, is certainly not a 'New Moses', rather the supreme Mediator who displaces the outmoded and partial type of Moses' mediation." John McGuckin, "Moses and the 'Mystery of Christ' in St. Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis," 29. McGuckin's opinion might be in response or have just taken into consideration Armendariz' book whose thesis is Christ being the new Moses. Luís M. Armendariz, *El Nuevo Moises, Estudios* ser. 3, vol. 5 (Madrid: Ediciones Fax, 1962). There is a detailed discussion of Armendariz book in Cassel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Science of the Grammarians*, 25–29. Liébaert writes that Moses' mediation is ministerial while that of Christ is mystical. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 221.

[892] The general consensus of the early Church fathers considered Moses the writer of the Pentateuch without considering any other options.

[893] Textual criticism at this point is critical. The Cyrillian text of Deut 18:18 reads as follows, ὀρθῶς πάντα ὅσα ἐλάλησαν, προφήτην αὐτοῖς ἀναστήσω **ὥσπερ σε.** καὶ θήσω τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, καὶ λαλήσει αὐτοῖς κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαι αὐτῷ. The biblical verse says that God will raise a prophet like you **ὥσπερ σε**, that is, like us human beings. While Cyril's following comments interprets the verse as if it is written **"ὡς ἐμε"** which implied that God will raise a prophet like himself, that is, God.

[894] *In Jo.* 1.393–4.

μυστιηρίων εἰσφέρει).[895] However, the fulfillment of the teachings of the law is Christ (τέλος δὲ παιδεύσεως νομικῆς ὁ Χριστὸς).[896]

All the terms used in this treatise were a combination of the terms we discussed separately in the previous section. We can understand the mechanism of Cyril's reasoning in this treatise. Deut 18:15–19 is an Old Testament verse written with a prophecy to promise a prophet. This prophet was not Moses, though Moses provides a type. Both Christ and Moses were mediators between God and the people. This mediation at the same time conveyed the inferiority of the people to accept the words of God. However, Christ is much more than Moses, he is a lawgiver, he is equal to God, he is God. He is the fulfillment of the teachings of the Law. He is the ultimate mediator who replaces those who preceded him, whether Moses or other prophets. The argument in this treatise did not flow very easily since Cyril was forced to change the verse's text to follow the argument. He made the text accommodate his logic, but at least we know that he tried hard to make his logic plausible.

The Manna.[897] The heading of the chapter is "Concerning the Manna, that it was a type (τύπος) of Christ's presence (παρουσίας) and of the spiritual graces through him."[898] Again Cyril sets the aim of his treatise explicitly expressed in the heading, he was going to transfer the type into reality, where the manna is a type of Christ. Cyril began his treatise with a confirmation of the previous conclusion, from the treatise on Moses, that Moses was a mediator and not a wonder worker. The performance of miracles is reserved to the Son and to the Father. Moses is the minister of the miracles, but not the bestower of them. It is not only that the small miracles do not belong to Moses, it also should not be compared to the greater miracle, that is, that of the bread from heaven (τὸν ἄρτον ἐξ

[895] *In Jo.* 1.395.

[896] *In Jo.* 1.395–6. Wilken reviewed the discussion of Deut 18 in connection with Jn 5:46 and Jn 9:28–9 in Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 65–7 but, as the title of the book indicates, within the context of Jewish polemics. Wilken also referred to Moses being the "minister of types and shadows…. Christ a Son and Lord became the arbitrator of a new covenant. I say new for it is renewing [ἀναμοργούσης] man to newness of holy life and through the evangelical way of life he is esteemed a true worshiper." He adds, "Our Lord Jesus Christ transformed [μεταχαράττων] the things which were in types into truth." *Ador.* 17. PG 68:1097C–D in Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 74.

[897] *In Jo.* 1.456–481. Book III Chapter VI.

[898] *In Jo.* 1.456.

οὐρανοῦ).[899] The manna is nothing else than the Only-Begotten Word of God himself who proceeds (ἐρχόμενος) from the essence of the Father since he is by nature life and quickens all things.[900] To confirm his assertion, Cyril decided to begin his proof that the manna is Christ, where Christ is given under the type of manna (ἐν τύπῳ τῷ μάννα).[901] He declared his thesis and began to prove it.

Cyril began with Ex 16:1–3 where the people of Israel are rallying against Moses and preferring to have remained in Egypt eating from their fleshpots and having their full of bread. Cyril considered the literal meaning (ἱστορίας) clear and thus proceeded directly to the spiritual one (τὸ πνευματικόν). Egypt is darkness and can be considered as the condition of the present life and the worldly state. Lusting for Egypt is lusting for the pleasures of the flesh.[902] However, once the law of God (ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμος) speaks to our minds and hearts (νοῦν) we abandon the bitter things and get supply for our spiritual journey, that is, grace and security through the precious blood (δι᾽ αἵματος τοῦ τιμίου) of Christ.[903]

Cyril combined Ex 16:4 *I am going to rain bread from heaven for you* with Ps 78:24–5, *he rained down on them manna to eat, and gave them the grain of heaven. Mortals ate of the bread of angels: he sent them food in abundance*. Cyril explained that the reasonable power in heaven (ὅτι τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δυνάμεων λογικῶν) is the Son; he is then the manna.[904] He most probably connected the "bread of angels" as the "powers" in heaven and from there he connected them with the divine power. Within this line of interpretation Cyril decided to digress for the second time and posed the question as to why God, who loves virtue, delayed punishment to those who craved in Num 11:34. His answer is that those who came out of Egypt had not yet received the heavenly manna, that is why their punishment was delayed, but those who already partook of the Lord's bread and transgressed then they were severely punished.[905] Here he was arguing for the divine powers imbedded in the bread from heaven and that this bread has a power to sustain against transgressing the law. Though Cyril said that he digressed, in reality it was the continuation of the previous point, he seemed to be apologizing for stretching it further.

---

[899] *In Jo.* 1.457.
[900] *In Jo.* 1.458.
[901] *In Jo.* 1.459.
[902] *In Jo.* 1.459–460.
[903] *In Jo.* 1.460.
[904] *In Jo.* 1.461.
[905] *In Jo.* 1.462.

The daily gathering of the manna as described in Ex 16:4 considers the reasonable manna as a type of the perceptual or spiritual manna (εἰς τύπον τοῦ μάννα τοῦ νοητοῦ τὸ αἰσθητὸν λογιούμεθα).[906] The spiritual manna signifies (κατασημαίνει) Christ himself. For this reason the gathering was daily, so that nothing would be kept for the morrow; this shows through a riddle (δι᾽ αἰνιγμάτων ... ὑποδηλῶν) that when the time of salvation comes and the Only-Begotten appears in the flesh in the world all legal types will be abolished (καταργηθήσονται πάντως οἱ διὰ τοῦ νόμου τύποι).[907] Again, the type will be abolished, or transferred to the true flesh and thus the old, that is, the old manna, need not be retained.

On the sixth day, the people gathered manna for two days (Ex 16:5). On the seventh day, which signifies (σημαίνει) the time of the advent of Christ, the true bread is among us and we do not need any further gathering of manna.[908] Again, the manna is not needed when the true bread of life is present; the truth replaces the type.

In Ex 16:6–8, the quail signifies (σημαίει) the Law for birds fly low over the earth. Therefore, those who are instructed through the Law (τοὺς διὰ νόμου παιδαγωγουμένους) have a more earthly piety through types (χθαμαλωτέραν διὰ τύπων θεοσέβειαν) such as the sacrifice and purification rites.[909] The verse notes that the quail was given in the evening therefore signifying (σημαίνοντος) the darkness of the letter (τὸ ἐν τῷ γράμματι σκοτεινὸν).[910] In the morning, the people of Israel gathered the manna; thus when the night disappears and the spiritual sun (ἡλίου τοῦ νοητοῦ) rises, then we receive the bread from heaven, that is, Christ.[911] For Christ is the fulfillment of the Law and the prophets (τὲλος γὰρ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁ Χριστὸς).[912] Cyril gave attention to the significance of every detail in the Exodus narrative, even morning and evening played a role in the transference of the type into truth.

Ex 16:13,14 describes the manna to be lying *around the camp* signifying that the spiritual food is available for all nations, that is, the Church of the Gentiles (τῆς ἐξ ἐθνῶν Ἐκκλησίας).[913] In Ex 16:15 Cyril used the literal exegesis to work his spiritual one. In the verse, the children of Israel ask

---

[906] *In Jo.* 1.463.
[907] *In Jo.* 1.463.
[908] Ibid.
[909] *In Jo.* 1.464–5.
[910] *In Jo.* 1.465.
[911] Ibid.
[912] *In Jo.* 1.466.
[913] Ibid.

"*what is it?*" Cyril explained, most probably based on Ex 16:31, that what was said in the form of a question is made the name of the thing and called it in the Syriac tongue (καὶ τῇ Ζύρων ἀποκαλοῦσι γλώττῃ Μάννα) *manna*, that is, *what is it?*[914] To this question Cyril concluded that this proves that the Jews did not know Christ. Even in his presence they ask, "who is he?" It was not common for Cyril to comment on the literal meaning of a word in this fashion, but it just shows that when he found an occasion to be innovative in his style, though not very often, he did not hesitate to do so.

Ex 16:19,20 again mentions the manna being left to the morning, where Cyril resumed the morning theme and wrote that this signifies the bright light (τὸν λαμπρὸν) of the Savior.[915] When the bright light of the morning appears, the shadow of the Law disappears. Those who kept the manna till the morning are a type of the Jewish multitudes who did not believe and desired to keep the Law to the letter and thus produced what is rotten and eaten by worms.[916] Cyril was not only showing that the law is transformed, but that even for those who cling to it, it does not do any good; furthermore it will produce corruption. Nothing good will come out of keeping the old law. Christ leads to incorruption, the law leads to utter corruption.

---

[914] *In Jn.* 1.466. The Harper Collins Study Bible footnotes manna to be the Aramaic/Syriac (man hu) that is the literal meaning of "what is it?" (Translation comments on Ex 16:15). This clarifies the meaning of Ex 16:31, *The house of Israel called it manna*, thus naming the strange food given to them from heaven "what is it," that is, "man hu" (manna). Cyril's knowledge of such Syriac linguistic nuances was not common. Payne Smith commented on Lk 6:17 where Cyril gives a detailed explanation for the meaning of the names of the Apostles. Smith followed the theory that Cyril read Jerome and thus points out the Apostles' names that Cyril copied from Jerome. In addition, he commented that Cyril got some of the names wrong. *Commentary upon the Gospel According to S. Luke, by S. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria*, 128. On another occasion Cyril commented on Lev 16:8 and explains the meaning of the goat "sent away," regarding which Smith seized an opportunity to prove that Cyril did not know Hebrew. Smith writes, "Therefore, not being acquainted with Hebrew, Cyril gives it another meaning of which the Greek may possibly admit: namely, that two lots were written for the goats, inscribed with two names." Ibid., 234. On another note, these are two examples of Cyril following the rhetorical principles of writing and giving an explanation of difficult words or names.

[915] *In Jo.* 1.467.

[916] Ibid.

Ex 16:33 *And Moses said to Aaron, "Take a jar,*[917] *and put an omer of manna in it, and place it before the Lord, to be kept throughout your generations*, speaks about the manna hidden in a jar. Cyril interpreted this to be the hidden wisdom in the inspired scriptures. He who treasures this manna treasures Christ in his heart. The point of comparison being as the manna is treasured in the jar, so is the spiritual manna, which is a type of Christ himself, treasured in the believer's heart. Cyril explained that the golden jar is the pious soul that works with the Word of God. Thus, the righteous person is described as having in a golden vessel, the spiritual manna. This spiritual manna, that is Christ, attained within us, leads us to incorruption.[918] This is where Cyril's theology that stressed that Christ's salvific act leads humanity to the newness of life and incorruption is fully manifested in his exegesis.

At this point Cyril ended his treatise on the manna. It is followed by Jn 6:34 where the disciples ask him to give them *this bread*. After some explanation Cyril concluded that Christ was drawing his disciples away from carnal imagination where they perceived themselves living on earth with a filled belly.[919] At this point he compared the demand of the disciples for bread, and the demand of the Samaritan woman for water.[920] Both thought that when they asked for bread or water they would have no need to ever worry again. Cyril commented that she did not understand the spiritual fountain, nor did the disciples understand the spiritual manna. Though Cyril ended the full treatise on the manna, that is, by explaining the Exodus text, he still carried on the thought to the end of the chapter where he linked the rest of the events with the manna.

For example, on Jn 6:35 Cyril wrote that God fed the people of Israel with manna while Moses was alive. When Moses died, Joshua, his

---

[917] Cyril wrote the verse describing the jar as a "golden jar" based on the LXX text, not the Masoretic text, on the basis of which St. Paul writes in Heb 9:4, *In it stood the golden altar of incense and the ark of the convent overlaid on all sides with gold, in which there were a golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant*. Both Cyril and Paul were Septuagint readers.

[918] *In Jo.* 1.469.

[919] *In Jo.* 1.470.

[920] Cyril's introduction of the comparison between the Samaritan woman and her asking for water with the story of the disciples in this chapter asking for bread was very interesting. For the Jewish tradition connected the manna as a heavenly food to the "water of life" as in Rev 7:17; 21:6; 22:1,17. Balz, *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 2.384. Was Cyril aware of this tradition and connected the manna to the water of life in the story of the Samaritan woman based on this tradition with some emendations, or is it his own interpretive genius?

successor, guided the Israelites across the river Jordan and once they reached the Promised Land the manna ceased. Joshua (Ἰησοῦς) is the type of the true Christ.[921] When Moses died, that meant the end of the Law and Jesus (Joshua) appeared to us, the true Jesus (who saved his people from sin) led us across the Jordan.[922] Once we enter the Promised Land we do not need the manna but the Bread of Life. Finally, when Cyril interprets Jn 6:55 *for my flesh is true food and my blood is true drink* he contrasts the mystic blessing (τὴν μυστικὴν εὐλογίαν) with the supply of manna.[923]

The examples of Moses and manna give us a clear understanding of the last form of Cyril's use of the Old Testament. When he was explaining a verse in the New Testament that can be clarified by elaborating on an Old Testament type, he transformed it to the truth in the New Testament, which mostly focuses on Christ being the truth of all Old Testament types.[924]

Conclusion

Cyril regards his spiritual exegesisas his τέλος: it does not represent merely the exegete's intention (his σκόπος), but the fulfillment, the realization of that intention. He consistently began with the literal exegesis, or ἱστορία. His use of the spiritual terms indicated that the interpretation that Cyril was undertaking was not merely to explain the meaning of difficult words and expand on the ἱστορία or clarify the names of geographical places and detect grammatical problems as secular interpreters did. Rather, it was an

---

[921] *In Jo.* 1.473. It has been written with this meaning, the humility (συνεστάλη) of Moses, that is to say (τουτέστιν) the type that is obedient to the shining model (ὅτε τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας ἤργησαν οἱ τύποι), is the true Joshua (Ἰησοῦς), that is, Christ. Τουτέστιν is the typical Cyrillian terminology to announce some sort of definition or a matter of fact. Discussed in Cyril's style Chapter III. Cyril was trying to say that Moses, who is a very simple (συνεστάλη) type of Christ, was followed by Joshua who was thus transferred to the true type of Christ.

[922] *In Jo.* 1.473.

[923] *In Jo.* 1.533.

[924] R. Wilken, "St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Mystery of Christ in the Bible," *Pro Ecclesia* 4 (1995): 454–478. Wilken's article is important for Cyril's interpretation of the Old Testament. McKinion adopted a different method of approach where he focused on Cyril's images such as the Ark of the Covenant, Burning Bush, Mercy Seat, Rod of Moses to "demonstrate the supreme importance of reading these images as analogies, and not Christological descriptions." McKinion, 141. He later on writes, "Cyril does not extract from analogies the faith but rather uses them to demonstrate what he believes." Ibid., 47.

undertaking, that included all the previously mentioned characteristics, but in addition, the deeper, spiritual, hidden, and enigmatic meaning of the passage. It was aimed at the spiritual meaning of the text. The text was a sacred text and its aim was to reveal the nature of the divine and to lead the believers to a spiritual and moral life.[925]

A closer look at the arrangement and invention of the text clarifies this point. The outward procedure of exegesis followed the rhetorical model and might deceive the plain reader that it was an exercise in rhetoric. However, a closer look revealed to the reader that Cyril constructs his arrangement around revealing the hidden meaning of the text. His division of chapters was geared to focus on the spiritual aspect. Within his general arrangement of Book Three of the commentary, he set one chapter and part of another to exclusively spiritual interpretation. He included them within his arrangement to convey to the reader the best possible understanding of the transference of the type to the truth. He even wrote in his introduction to the chapter that we took as a working example—Chapter Three—to alert his readers that he was "swimming in the deep and wide sea of divine contemplation." It was a special type of exegesis, not limited to ἱστορία but reaching beyond to divine contemplation. The detailed analysis of Book Three conducted in this chapter reveals how his exegesis was carefully crafted to convey the spiritual message.

Cyril's use of terms indicated his careful choice of terminology. He completely avoided the terms ἀλληγορέω or ἀλληγορὶα because he never intended his spiritual exegesisto be an allegory. His choice of words indicated that his spiritual exegesisfocuses on transferring the type τύπος in the Old Testament to the truth of Christ. This type was sometimes shrouded in mystery (μυστήριον) or was hidden (κρύπτω) and thus we have to search and contemplate (θεωρία, θεωρέω) to reach the true meaning. The true meaning could also be written in the form of an enigma (αἴνιγμα) purposely and Cyril's attempt is to discover and unveil the type. Some texts seem to be simple, but spiritual πνευματικός exegesis has to look for the

[925] Cassel argued that there are three principles upon which Cyril's exegesis is based. First, he viewed the Bible as a unified book the culmination of which is in the coming of Christ and this governs the interpretation. Second, he followed the rules of the grammarians in his exegesis. Third, the grammar of the passage regulated allegorical interpretation. J. D. Cassel, "Key Principles in Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis," *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 420. The third principle was hard to prove, though the grammar of a passage was crucial and Cyril never forces a meaning on the text, but the spiritual interpretation was based on the presence of a type of Christ or not, not the grammar.

deeper βάθυς sense and know what it signifies σημεῖον. He also explained the simile εἰκών and figures σχῆμα in the text that pointed directly to the person of Christ. His means to reach these spiritual meanings was through a careful examination of the text in different ways διασκοπέω. Cyril's terminology revealed his method and his method was shaped by his choice of terms.

Cyril depended heavily on the Old Testament as his source for proving his dogmas and the Christian faith. He is constantly facing the Jewish opposition in the very heated situation in Alexandria, so his use of the Old Testament is crucial in polemics. In addition, the Old Testament was his credible source of proof, and witness to his arguments. In summary, Cyril uses the Old Testament in four basic ways. The Old Testament was used to provide the credible witness that testifies on Cyril's behalf. The Old Testament was the authoritative literary witness that substituted for the ancient literary witness. Moreover, the Old Testament provided Cyril with the dogmatic material to use in his polemics as in his use of the Old Testament titles of the divine. Finally, the Old Testament was the very fertile place that provided the types that reveal to us the true Christ when we meet him in the New Testament.

Cyril's spiritual exegesis was the aim of his endeavors. His use of literary tools was his means of conveying this spiritual meaning to his readers.

CONCLUSION

The early Christian writers were the archivists, formulators, and transmitters of church dogma and history for the early years of Christianity. The literary heritage that was handed down to us is the product of their arduous effort to put this early world on paper. Though modern day Christians and interested researchers would like to see more of this world presented and recorded, we have to reconstruct the world of the early church through what is presently available. This work has focused on one of these writers, Cyril of Alexandria, and has paid close attention to his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Since Cyril was a prolific writer and his literary activity spanned his lifetime, the focus on the Johannine commentary served the following interests.

Cyril's fame arose from the Nestorian controversy, and most research has been focused on this aspect of his life. However, this aspect of his career is limited to the later Christological debate related to Nestorius, it focuses on the latter part of Cyril's life, whether existential or literary, and it focused on the dogmatic aspect of his writings. Although those are significant, Cyril was much more than that. He was primarily an exegete who formed his theological understanding through lengthy studies of biblical books and through erudite investigation of scripture. He documented the outcome of this erudition in his commentaries that constituted more than seventy percent of his writings. Most, if not all, of these commentaries were written before the Nestorian controversy that forced him to shift his literary attention to the more pressing demands of his church—fighting heretical teachings—especially those of Nesotirus. To remedy this deficiency in research, a closer look at an early commentary of Cyril is expected to balance and fill some of the gaps of Cyrillian studies.

The first step of investigation is to suggest a date for the commentary under investigation. This posed a greater question, at what stages of their lives did early church writers actually begin writing? What were the factors that contributed to their literary creation? Were these factors more secular or ecclesial? Therefore, an investigation of the formative years of Cyril was

crucial to understanding the tradition and milieu within which Cyril's mind budded with these great biblical insights. The scanty information about Cyril's early years was able to provide us with the following depiction of Cyril's life.

Cyril's family moved from the southern to the northern part of Egypt. This move allowed his uncle Theophilus, from an early age, to be in close contact with the church and receive special attention from St. Athanasius, the archbishop of the Church of Alexandria at the time. When Theophilus became archbishop, Cyril was still a child and Theophilus, following the tradition of the time and the footsteps of his predecessors, took care of the young Cyril's upbringing. Cyril spent his formative years primarily in the patriarchal residence in Alexandria. There he was able to take advantage of great educational opportunities present in the patriarchate. For instance, he received private tutoring in the residence—private education was a very common practice of the time. His writings indicate that he reached a high level of education; therefore, we can suggest that he went through the entire curriculum of Greek *paideia* of his time. This curriculum consisted of three seven-year periods. This also indicates that he would have finished his secular education by the age of twenty-one at the latest. During the time of Cyril, the part of the Greek *paideia* represented in the gymnasium and its physical activity was replaced with spiritual education. This replacement indicates the influence of Christianity on the Greek educational system. Historical accounts inform us that Cyril attained his moral education when he spent five years in the Nitrean desert. His stay in the desert inducted him into biblical studies as historical accounts indicate to us. Serapion the Wise was the most plausible mentor during his stay in the desert. When the Origenist controversy broke out, Cyril's spiritual education was abruptly ended and he was summoned to Alexandria where he resumed and finished his literary education. Therefore, he was ready to begin his career.

It is most probable that at this stage of his life he was appointed a reader and the Gospel-exegete of the patriarchate. He had all the faculties required for this position. Cyril completed his literary education and received a scriptural insight during his stay in the Nitrean desert. Reading in these early years required the reader to be a good exegete. He thus began putting his thoughts in writing. This is when he began writing his first commentary, his commentary on the Gospel of John. We know that around year 406, at the age of twenty-eight, he began his literary activity. Therefore, we can safely suggest that *The Commentary on the Gospel of John* was written around that time.

The commentary is a dogmatic exegetical work. Thus, an investigation of the dogma and exegesis of the commentary is the first place to begin. The Johannine Gospel is a theological Gospel and throughout church history has been a major source of theological inquiry and statements. Therefore, Cyril's exegesis of John can give us a comprehensive and representative idea of his theological beliefs. Cyril's main theological framework is the Trinity. A researcher cannot understand Cyril's Christology if there is no understanding of the Trinity. For Cyril, the Christian God is a Trinitarian God. What distinguishes Christianity from any other religions is its firm assertion of the Trinity. If the Trinity is not important, the divinity would not have revealed itself in three persons nor would it have been necessary to be baptized in the name of the Trinity, that is, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The emphatic revelation of the three persons through scripture obliges a Christian to believe, contemplate, and publicly confess the Trinity. After explaining the imperative belief in the Trinity, Cyril then presented his main thesis about the interrelationship of the three persons. All things are from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. All activity of the Trinity is understood within this formulation while maintaining an extremely strong emphasis on the oneness of the Trinity and the oneness of its activity. Cyril spoke about each person of the Trinity within this framework. Thus, Cyril explained how the creation, Incarnation, and redemption are all Trinitarian activities.

Within this Trinitarian understanding, Cyril emphasized in his commentary the equality of each person of the Trinity. The Son is equal to the Father and the Holy Spirit is equal to the Father and the Son. Therefore, by affirming the equality of the Son he reduced even further the validity of the Arian argument and, by affirming the equality and the divinity of the Holy Spirit, he diminished the Macedonian argument (though he never mentioned it by name).

In light of the oneness of the Trinity that Cyril affirmed, we understand the Son's work in the Incarnation and redemption. Cyril explained that the aim of the Incarnation is to condemn sin in the flesh, to overcome death, and through the regeneration of the Spirit become children of God. The Son is the Creator and Life and when he is united with the flesh and takes it as his own, he bestows life to those who believe in him. The Son gives humanity the newness of life. The unity of the Word with his body is not separated at any time after the Incarnation. Even after the ascension one cannot divide Christ into two. This unity and the oneness of Christ is not only preserved during the ascension, it still persists even when the Son of Man descends from heaven. The indivisibility of the

humanity from the divinity of the Incarnate Word persists at all times and under all conditions. The indivisibility and oneness of the Son has to be preserved not only within his own nature but also within the Trinity. Thus, the rise of the Nestorian duality of the nature of the Son was not only a threat to the nature of the Son but also it has very serious implications on the nature of the Trinity itself. Understanding the Trinitarian concept of Cyril gives us a clear insight to Cyril's relentless fight against Nestorius. He was fighting not only to preserve the oneness of Christ, but also to preserve the oneness of the Trinity. In effect, he was fighting to preserve the essence of the Christian deity.

The nature and work of the Holy Spirit was greatly emphasized in the *Commentary on John*. Cyril explained that the Holy Spirit is God and those who partake of the Holy Spirit are partakers of God. Those who willingly accept the Spirit to dwell in their hearts also intellectually perceive the divine. The indwelling of the Spirit is the beginning of the newness of life. Cyril clearly wrote that it is the Spirit of the Son and is in the Son. This is different from saying that the Spirit *is of* the Son. The Spirit of the Son is implanted in humanity and sanctifies it. Humanity received the Spirit during creation, after the fall the sanctification of the Holy Spirit departed from humanity but after the resurrection and after the ascension, the Father bestowed the Holy Spirit, through the Son to humanity once again. The restoration of humanity is the aim of the Incarnation, and is the aim of the Trinity where all things were from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.

The Trinity is the main focus of the dogmatic aspect of the dogmatic exegetical Johannine commentary. The second part of the work must deal with the exegetical aspect of the commentary. Cyril followed the conventional Greek secular method of commentaries. This included writing the verse that is to be commented upon, and then proceeding to explain all aspects of the text. However, the choice of the verse included exegesis as well, for texts were written in continuous script and division of the text was part of the exegetical procedure. After the division of the text was decided, Cyril, as well as other secular professional commentators, began to comment on the text following rhetorical rules. This procedure included explaining grammatical problems, difficult words, or geographical locations and historical facts, and all other complex aspects of the text. This was the grammarians work. Applying these grammatical τέχνη to the Johannine commentary we discovered that Cyril followed all the grammarian's τέχνη. He showed exceptional attention to verse division, grammar, great interest in geography, and attention to historical aspects of the texts. These

grammarian's aspects also showed that the literary exercise in the commentary had a great impact on the theological outcome of the exegesis. For examples the effect of ὅ γέγονεν on the division of Jn 1:3,4 or as in the case of Jn 5:36–38 and Jn 6:27 where division is consequential on interpretation. Another example is that of Jn 20:11–30 where the division depended on the role of the character in the pericope. Cyril also paid great attention to grammatical nuances, as in the case of the definite article, or remarks on punctuation. His special attention to geography attracted the attention of many researches and this literary aspect had its impact on his exegetical understanding of texts.

Cyril's literary style was complex and his arguments lengthy. His vocabulary was difficult, and in addition he used unfamiliar words and coined many composite words of his own. Because of this characteristic style and because he was not an orator who used flowery expressions and artistic imagery, there has been relatively little research devoted to the literary aspect in his work. Attention was given to orators like the Cappadocians, John Chrysostom, and others and the research on these orators is primarily confined to a study of style. Nevertheless, style is only one aspect of the five parts of speech in Greek rhetoric. Studying the literary work of a writer should include the investigation of the five parts of speech, that is, to investigate also his invention and arrangement.

Cyril proved to be extremely crafty in invention and arrangement. Since the genre of the text is a commentary, he was bound to follow the text closely but within this framework he exhibited great art in utilizing different kinds of speech. Within the commentary framework the reader can find full rhetorical treatises on different topics as if they form a separate literary entity. In his argumentation with heretics he followed very closely the forensic rhetoric, with a Christian flavor. In his arrangement and invention he divided his text on a theological basis. In his division of a scene, which was usually based on the exit of the characters from the scene, Cyril used the exit theologically, to represent exit from the presence of the Jewish leaders, or exit from the scene of Jewish locations such as Jerusalem to indicate that this meant the departure of grace from the Jews who are unwilling to accept his proclamation.

Even if Cyril's exegesis was limited to the literary aspects just enumerated, his work would still have been a literary masterpiece. But that is not all that Cyril wanted to produce. He was a Christian teacher who was appointed as a Gospel-exegete and he was working on a sacred text. The aim of the sacred text was to give spiritual guidance to those who believe in it and give the basic theological beliefs to the community. Thus, Cyril's

commentary cannot be addressed within the confines of literary work. The commentary set the foundation of a strong Trinitarian theology and in addition this text provides a spiritual aspect. Cyril was aware of this aspect and he constantly elaborated on the deeper spiritual meaning of the text. After he explicated the text from the literary point of view, Cyril directed the attention of his readers to the deeper, spiritual, hidden, and enigmatic meaning of the passage. He completely avoided allegorical interpretation. He constantly indicated that his spiritual exegesisfocused on transforming the type in the Old Testament to the truth of Christ. Since such truths are sometimes shrouded in mystery therefore the work of the Christian interpreter, and any able person who could do that, was to contemplate the true meaning and reveal it to others. The type of Christ is sometimes shrouded in mystery or hidden and the true meaning is revealed through contemplation. The true meaning could be written purposely enigmatically or could be written in simple texts that need to be contemplated more in depth to discover the deeper meaning and understand what it signifies. Old Testament texts also reveal similes and figures of the person of Christ. Cyril's spiritual interpretation was aimed to reveal the type of Christ, contemplate the mystery, and discover the deep and hidden meaning of scripture.

Cyril depended greatly on the Old Testament in his exegesis. For Cyril the Old Testament provided an authoritative source for reference, citations, and credible characters in his argumentations. Furthermore, the Old Testament provided Cyril the dogmatic material to use in his polemics. In addition, the Old Testament gave Cyril the source of his types that reveal to us the true Christ.

Once the true Christ is revealed, Cyril took his readers to the depth of this revelation. Christ is the one who reveals the Father. Thus the true significance of the revelation of the Son is to understand fully the aim of the Incarnation and redemption. The Incarnation cannot be fully comprehended without having a deeper understanding of the Trinity. Because of that, Cyril presented a fully comprehensive understanding of Christian dogma. This is the reason Cyril called his Johannine Commentary a "dogmatic exegetical" work. His mastery of the art of rhetoric enabled him to exegete the Gospel text. He took this art to a further level when he delved into the deeper meaning of the text and revealed the truth of Christ. This truth when elaborated in his exegesis led to a spiritual and dogmatic output. The output is *The Commentary on the Gospel of John*.

The Commentary on the Gospel of John is the treasure that reveals Cyril's full Trinitarian theology and consequently his Christology and

Pneumatology. It is an indispensable source for understanding Cyril's exegesis with its literary and spiritual aspects. Finally, it is the source to understand the theological and exegetical framework by which Cyril approached scripture, dogma, and later heretical confrontations.

APPENDIX

The aim of this appendix is to show the Johannine Gospel text upon which Cyril worked. Since Cyril worked very closely on the text, it is necessary and appropriate to present the text that is the focus of the interpretation. In addition, the appendix gives some indications of Cyril's exegetical methods. As previously discussed, the division of the verses is one of the primary steps in the process of interpretation, therefore, the appendix shows these divisions. Each paragraph is an entry to an exegetical segment. The chapter and verse numbers are those of the modern Nestle-Aland edition and are kept in the text to give a comparative view of how Cyril differed or coincided with the modern editions' division. The square brackets indicate a text missing from Cyril's working text although present in Nestle-Aland. The underlined text indicates variant readings.

The following are observations that can be extracted from the text. Since the art of invention and arrangement are special characteristics of Cyril's exegetical work, the appendix shows how Cyril divided the text in his commentary. It can be observed that John Chapter One and Chapter Seventeen are chapters with great theological implications; thus, we find it clear from the commentary division that Cyril gave very special attention to these two chapters in his commentary. Jn 1:1–4 is interpreted in six chapters. Jn 17:1–20 is interpreted in nine chapters where the first three verses take three chapters on their own in comparison to Jn 17:22–18:23 that is interpreted in one chapter.

It should also be noted that in the last book—Book Twelve—the text divisions are longer. As previously mentioned, Cyril explained, by the end of the Gospel text, most of the major dogmatic issues and by the last three chapters of the text he was commenting more briefly. For example, Jn 20:1–9; 21:1–6; 21:7–14 are longer biblical verses combined in one interpretative segment in comparison to Cyril's great precision in John 1 and John 17. The division of the biblical text, together with the division of the commentary chapters are extremely indicative of Cyril's invention and arrangement.

The division of Gospel verses and chapters is meticulous. It is to be observed that Jn 5:47 takes a chapter of its own in the commentary. Cyril devoted the chapter to the writings of the Old Testament that the Jewish leaders believe in and proves this through giving a detailed explanation of Deut 18:15–18, while Jn 8:23 is divided and explained in two different chapters.

As previously mentioned, Cyril also perceives the staging of the event in a different manner. This can be noticed from his division of the text in comparison to the Nestle-Aland text. If we take the example of Jn 4:13 where *Jesus said to her [the Samaritan woman]* is the beginning of verse thirteen considering it as the beginning of the scene. In comparison Cyril puts this same text at the end of the passage he is to explicate. For the ancient division, or at least for Cyril, this is the end of a scene, in modern editions, this is considered the beginning of the event.[926]

Cyril, in his exegesis, gave great attention to the presence of the definite article before the name of Ἰησοῦς. It should be observed the number of articles attributed to the name in the Johannine text. It needs further critical textual research to conclude whether this is Cyril's addition to the text or an Alexandrian textual variant.[927] The article in addition to the name was added four times.[928] In two other instances, one article is added to ὁ μονογενὴς in Jn 1:18 and to the name of Joseph of Arimathea (ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας) in Jn 19:38.

[926] The same applies to the following: Jn 4:13, 19, 20, 25, 31, 34, 46 Jn 5:8, 11, 14. Jn 6:2, 7, 10, 53. Jn 8:25. Jn 11:34. Jn 19:15.

[927] The following verses have an article added to the name Ἰησοῦς, Jn 5:1. Jn 6:14, 69. Jn 7:14, 21. Jn 8:58, 59. Jn 9: 35. Jn 11:9, 11, 38, 46, 51. Jn 12: 16, 30, 36. Jn 13:8, 29, 31, 36, 38. Jn 14:6. Jn 17:1. Jn 18:1, 2, 20, 23. Jn 19:11, 19, 30. Jn 20:15, 16, 17, 24. Jn 21:13, 14.

[928] Jn 4:16. Jn 6:6. Jn 18:5 and Jn 21:17.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Book One

Chapter One
1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος,

Chapter Two
καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν,

Chapter Three
καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

Chapter Four
1:2 οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

Chapter Five
1:3 πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν.

Chapter Six
ὃ γέγονεν 1:4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,

Chapter Seven
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων·
1:5 καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.
1:6 Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης·1:7 οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός,[929]
[ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ.]
1:8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός.

---

[929] The first part of Jn 1:7a is repeated again and dealt with separately.

Chapter Eight

1:9 Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν,

Chapter Nine

ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
1:10 ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν,[930]
καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο,
καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω.
1:11 εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον.
1:12 ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,
1:13 οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.
1:14 Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,
καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.
1:15 Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν [λέγων,]
Οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον, Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.
1:16 ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν
καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος·1:17 ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.

Chapter Ten

1:18 θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.
1:19 Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν [πρὸς αὐτὸν] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν, Σὺ τίς εἶ; 1:20 καὶ ὡμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι Ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός.
1:21 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν, Τί οὖν; [Σύ] Ἠλίας εἶ; καὶ λέγει, Οὐκ εἰμί. Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, Οὔ.
[1:22 εἶπαν οὖν αὐτῷ, Τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς]
τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ;1:23 [ἔφη,] Ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, [Εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.]
1:24 Καὶ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων.

---

[930] Jn 1:10a is explained within the text of verse nine. *In Jo.* 1.112.

[1:25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἠλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης;1:26 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων,][931]

Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι·

[μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκε[932] ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε,1:27 ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.1:28 Ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.]

Book Two

1:29 Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν
καὶ λέγει, Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.
1:30 οὗτός ἐστι περὶ οὗ [ἐγὼ] εἶπον,

[Ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.][933]

1:31 κἀγὼ οὐκ ἤδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων.

Chapter One

1:32 Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι Τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. 1:33 κἀγὼ οὐκ ἤδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.
1:34 κἀγὼ ἑώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
1:35 Τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο 1:36 καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει, Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου
1:37[καὶ] ἤκουσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ [αὐτοῦ] λαλοῦντος καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
1:38 στραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ζητεῖτε;

---

[931] Jn 1:25,26 are not explicitly mentioned in the exegetical text but Cyril insinuates to their meaning during his explanation of Jn 1:24.

[932] μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκε is mentioned within the exegetical text in *In Jo.* 1.164, where it is written as ἕστηκεν and Metzger has noted that only Origen and Cyril have this variance among the fathers. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 171.

[933] Not mentioned explicitly but is insinuated within the text.

οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ῥαββί (ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον Διδάσκαλε), ποῦ μένεις;
1:39 λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε.
ἦλθαν οὖν καὶ εἶδον ποῦ μένει καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην· ὥρα ἦν ὡς δεκάτη.
1:40 Ἦν Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου εἷς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ·1:41 εὑρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτος τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Χριστός)·1:42 καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.
1:43 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ εὑρίσκει Φίλιππον. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
[1:44 ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου.]
1:45 εὑρίσκει Φίλιππος τὸν Ναθαναὴλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται εὑρήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ.
[1:46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ,]
Ἐκ Ναζαρὲτ δύναταί τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι;
[λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Φίλιππος,]
Ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε.
[1:47 εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναὴλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ,]
Ἴδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστιν.
[1:48 λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ,]
Πόθεν με γινώσκεις;
[ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,]
Πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἶδόν σε.
[1:49 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ,]
Ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
[1:50 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,]
Ὅτι εἶπόν σοι ὅτι εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; μείζω τούτων ὄψει.
[1:51 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ,]
Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

2:1 Καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκεῖ· 2:2 ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν γάμον. 2:3 καὶ ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι. 2:4 καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι; οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου.

2:5 λέγει ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ τοῖς διακόνοις, Ὅ τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν ποιήσατε.

[2:6 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι ὑδρίαι ἓξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι, χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς.]

2:7 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος. καὶ ἐγέμισαν [αὐτὰς] ἕως ἄνω.

2:8 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἀντλήσατε νῦν καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ· οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν.2:9 ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει πόθεν ἐστίν, οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ ἠντληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ, φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος 2:10 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησι καὶ ὅτε μεθυσθῶσι τότε τὸν ἐλάσσω· σὺ τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι.

2:11 Ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

[2:12 Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. 2:13 Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς.]

2:14 καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστερὰς καὶ τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους,

2:15 καὶ ποιήσας ὡς φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ

[τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν, 2:16 καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν,]

Ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου.[934]

2:17 Ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν, Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεταί με.

[2:18 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ,]

Τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς;

[2:19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,]

---

[934] Cyril repeats his exegesis of verse fourteen again.

Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον
[καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. 2:20 εἶπαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι,]
Τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν;
2:21 ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. 2:22 ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγε, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
2:23 Ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει·
2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς
διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας 2:25 καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.
3:1 Ἦν δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων· 3:2 οὗτος ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
Ῥαββί, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα δύναται ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ. 3:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 3:4 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν [ὁ] Νικόδημος,
Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὤν; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι; 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς,
[Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι,]
ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
3:6 τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστι, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν.
3:7 μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὅτι εἶπόν σοι, Δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. 3:8 τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶ πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος.
3:9 ἀπεκρίθη Νικόδημος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι; 3:10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;
3:11 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν,

καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε.
3:12 εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε; 3:13 καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
3:14 καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὕψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 3:15 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
3:16 Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
3:17 οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.
3:18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.
3:19 αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς·
[ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα.]
3:20 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·
[3:21 ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα.]
3:22 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ] εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ [καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβεν μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν.] 3:23 ἦν δὲ [καὶ ὁ] Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ, καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο· 3:24 οὔπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης.
3:25 Ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰουδαίου περὶ καθαρισμοῦ.
3:26 καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ,
Ῥαββί, ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ἴδε οὗτος βαπτίζει καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν. 3:27 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν,
Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν οὐδὲ ἓν ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
3:28 αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον [ὅτι Οὐκ εἰμὶ] ἐγὼ Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' ὅτι Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου.

3:29 ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην νυμφίος ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου ὁ ἑστηκὼς καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ χαρᾷ χαίρει διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου. αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται.
3:30 ἐκεῖνον δεῖ αὐξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι.

Chapter Two

3:31 Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν·
ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστι καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ.
ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν·
[3:32 ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ,]
καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει.

Chapter Three

3:33 ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν.
3:34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ,
οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα.

Chapter Four

3:35 ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.
3:36 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον·
ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωήν,
ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.
4:1 Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Κύριος ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης 4:2 καίτοι γε αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐβάπτιζεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 4:3 ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
4:4 ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας. 4:5 ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχὰρ πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακὼβ Ἰωσὴφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ·
4:6 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ·
ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη.
4:7 Ἔρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλῆσαι ὕδωρ. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δός μοι πεῖν· 4:8 οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσι. 4:9 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρῖτις,
Πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ ζητεῖς πεῖν αἰτεῖς ὕδωρ γυναικὸς Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης; οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις. 4:10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ,

Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκέ [ἄν] σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν. 4:11 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή.

Κύριε, οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν;

4:12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιε καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτοῦ; 4:13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ,

Πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν· 4:14 ὃς δ' ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 4:15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή,

[Κύριε,] δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν.

4:16 Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Ὕπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε.

4:17 [λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω][935] λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Καλῶς εἶπας ὅτι Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω· 4:18 πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀνήρ· τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας. 4:19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή,

Κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ.

4:20 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ. 4:21 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

Πίστευέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν [τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε] ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί.

Chapter Five

4:22 ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἴδαμεν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν.

4:23 ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν. 4:24 πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. 4:25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή,

Οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μεσ[σ]ίας ἔρχεται ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα.

---

[935] The variant reading from the Nestle Aland reads, ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα.

4:26 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.
4:27 Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει·
οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπεν, Τί ζητεῖς ἢ Τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς;
4:28 ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν
καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, 4:29 Δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα [ὅσα] ἃ ἐποίησα, μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;
4:30 ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν.
4:31 Ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Ῥαββί, φάγε. 4:32 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
Ἐγὼ βρῶσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε.
[ὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.]
4:33 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Μήτις ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν; 4:34 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.
4:35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστι καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται;
ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαί εἰσι πρὸς θερισμόν.
ἤδη 4:36 ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων. 4:37 ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἀληθινός ἐστιν ὅτι Ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων.
4:38 ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασι καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.
4:39 Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης ὅτι Εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα.
4:40 ὡς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρῖται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν μεῖναι παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας. 4:41 καὶ πολλῷ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,
4:42 τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.
4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· 4:44 αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει.
4:45 ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν.

4:46 Ἦλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησεν τὸ
ὕδωρ οἶνον.
[καὶ] ἦν δέ τις βασιλικὸς οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἠσθένει ἐν Καφαρναούμ. 4:47 οὗτος
ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἥκει ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἰάσηται αὐτοῦ
τὸν υἱόν, ἤμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν. 4:48 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
πρὸς αὐτόν,
Ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδητε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε. 4:49 λέγει πρὸς
αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλικός,
Κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου.
4:50 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πορεύου, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ.
ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ λόγῳ [ὃν] ᾧ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ
ἐπορεύετο. 4:51 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ
ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ.
4:52 ἐπύθετο οὖν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην, ἐν ᾗ κομψότερον ἔσχε,
καὶ εἶπον [οὖν] αὐτῷ ὅτι χθὲς ὥραν ἑβδόμην ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ
πυρετός. 4:53 ἔγνω οὖν ὁ πατὴρ ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐν ᾗ
εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι Ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς
καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη. 4:54 Τοῦτο [δὲ] πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον
ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
5:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς
Ἱεροσόλυμα. 5:2 ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ [τῇ
προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα] ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδὰ, πέντε
στοὰς ἔχουσα. 5:3 ἐν ταύταις κατέκειτο πλῆθος πολὺ τῶν
ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν. 5:4 ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ
ὕδατος κίνησιν. ἄγγελος γὰρ Κυρίου κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν
ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ καὶ ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ. ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς
μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑγὴς ἐγίνετο, ᾧ δήποτε καείχετο
νοσήματι.
5:5 ἦν δέ τις ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ
ἀσθενείᾳ αὐτοῦ· 6:6 τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον καὶ
γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει,
λέγει αὐτῷ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς Θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι; 5:7 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ
ἀσθενῶν,
Κύριε, ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα ὅταν ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν
κολυμβήθραν· ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει.
5:8 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἔγειρε
ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει. 5:9 καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιὴς ὁ
ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἦρε τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ καὶ περιεπάτει. Ἦν δὲ
σάββατον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

5:10 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ, Σάββατόν ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἆραι τὸν κράβαττόν σου.
5:11 ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, Ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῆ ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει. 5:12 ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν,
Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπών σοι, Ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου καὶ περιπάτει; 5:13 ὁ δὲ ἰαθεὶς οὐκ ᾔδει τίς ἐστιν, ὁ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐξένευσεν ὄχλου ὄντος ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. 5:14 μετὰ ταῦτα εὑρίσκει αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
Ἴδε ὑγιὴς γέγονας. μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, ἵνα μὴ χεῖρόν σοί τι γένηται.
5:15 ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἶπε [ἀνήγγειλεν] τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑγιῆ.
5:16 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ. 5:17 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς,
Ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι.
5:18 διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυε τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν θεόν ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ.

Chapter Six

5:19 Ἀπεκρίνατο οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ [ἂν] ἐκεῖνος ποιεῖ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ.
5.20 ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν
καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ,
καὶ μείζονα τούτων ἔργα δείξει αὐτῷ , ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε.
5:21 ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῳοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζῳοποιεῖ.

Chapter Seven

5:22 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ υἱῷ,

Chapter Eight

5:23 ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα. ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν.
5:24 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν.

5:25 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν.
5:26 ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. 5:27 καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν.
5:28 μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ἐν ᾗ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσουσι τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ 5:29 καὶ ἐξελεύσονται, οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως.

Chapter Nine

5:30 Οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν· καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω, καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν, ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με Πατρός.
5:31 ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής· 5:32 ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.
5:33 ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ·
5:34 ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε.

Book Three

Chapter One

5:35 ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιαθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ.
5:36 ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου· τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκε· 5:37 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ [ἐκεῖνος] αὐτὸς μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ ἐμοῦ.

Chapter Two

οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε, 5:38 καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα, ὅτι ὃν ἀπέσταλκεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε.
5:39 ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς δοκεῖτε ὑμεῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ [ἐκεῖναί] αυ εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ· 5:40 καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε.

5:41 Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνω, 5:42 ἀλλὰ ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.
5:43 ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετέ με· ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήμψεσθε.
5:44 πῶς δύνασθε [ὑμεῖς] πιστεύειν, δόξαν παρὰ [ἀλλήλων] ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνοντες, [καὶ] τὴν δὲ δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε;
5:45 μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε.
5:46 εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν.

Chapter Three

5:47 εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν πιστεύσετε;

Chapter Four

6:1 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης [τῆς Γαλιλαίας] τῆς Τιβεριάδος.
6:2 ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἐθεώρουν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων. 6:3 ἀνῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. 6:4 ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
6:5 ἐπάρας οὖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγει πρὸς Φίλιππον, Πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι; 6:6 τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν. 6:7 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Φίλιππος,
Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχύ τι λάβῃ.
6:8 λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, 6:9 Ἔστιν παιδάριον ὧδε ὃ ἔχει πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους καὶ δύο ὀψάρια· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τί ἐστιν εἰς τοσούτους; 6:10 εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι.
6:11 ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον.
6:12 ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν, λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται. 6:13 συνήγαγον

οὖν καὶ ἐγέμισαν δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων ἐκ τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων ἃ ἐπερίσσευσαν τοῖς βεβρωκόσι.
6:14 Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
6:15 Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἵνα ποιήσωσι βασιλέα, ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.
6:16 Ὡς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ.
καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 6:18 ἥ τε θάλασσα ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος διεγείρετο.
6:19 ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἰκοσιπέντε ἢ τριάκοντα θεωροῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμενον, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. 6:20 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
6:21 ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο τὸ πλοῖον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον.
6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἰδὼν ὅτι πλοιάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἕν ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἀνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνῆλθε [καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν] τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀλλ᾽ [μόνοι] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον· 6:23 ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθε πλοιάρια ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.
6:24 ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
6:25 καὶ εὑρόντες αὐτὸν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ῥαββί, πότε ὧδε γέγονας;
6:26 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτέ με οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖον, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε.
6:27 ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον,

Chapter Five

ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός.
6:28 εἶπον οὖν [πρὸς αὐτόν] αὐτῷ, Τί ποιῶμεν ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ; 6:29 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,

Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος.
6:30 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι; τί ἐργάζῃ; 6:31 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἔφαγον τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθώς ἐστι γεγραμμένον, Ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

Chapter Six

6:32 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν· 6:33 ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ.
6:34 Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν, Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον. 6:35 εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς·
ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε.
6:36 ἀλλ' εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἑωράκατέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε.
6:37 Πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει,
καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω,

Book Four

Chapter One

6:38 ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με Πατρός. 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
6:40 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
6:41 Ἐγόγγυζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
6:42 καὶ ἔλεγον, Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; πῶς νῦν λέγει ὅτι Ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα;
6:43 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Μὴ γογγύζετε μετ' ἀλλήλων. 6:44 οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν, κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
6:45 ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ·

πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ.
6:46 οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα ἑώρακέ τις εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα.
6:47 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Chapter Two

6:48 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. 6:49 οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον¸ τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμω καὶ ἀπέθανον· 6:50 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.
6:51 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,
καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.
6:52 ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες πῶς δύναται ἡμῖν οὗτος δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν; 6:53 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰσοῦς
ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίτηε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
6:54 ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καῖ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
6:55 ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστι βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθής ἐστι πόσις
6:56 ὁ τρώπων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, κἀγὼ αὐτῷ

Chapter Three

6:57 καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι' ἐμέ.
6:58 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὁ τρώγων μου τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
6:59 Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ διδάσκων ἐν Καφαρναούμ.
6:60 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπαν, Σκληρός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος· τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν; 6:61 εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
Τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζε 6:62 ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον;
6:63 τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζῳοποιοῦν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν·
τὰ ῥήματα ἃ [ἐγω] λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστιν.

6:64 ἀλλ᾽ εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν. ᾔδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν. 6:65 καὶ ἔλεγεν, Διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου.

6:66 Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ οὐκέτι μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν.

6:67 εἶπεν οὖν τοῖς δώδεκα ὁ Ἰησοῦς , Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;

Chapter Four

6:68 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε, πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις,

6:69 καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν [ὅτι] σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

6:70 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην; καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν. 6:71 ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου· οὗτος γὰρ ἔμελλεν αὐτόν παραδιδόναι, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.

Chapter Five

7:1 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι.

7:2 [ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία.]

7:3 εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, Μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου θεωρήσουσι [σου] τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖς· 7:4 οὐδεὶς γάρ τι ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι. εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ. 7:5 οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν.

7:6 λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πάρεστιν, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος πάντοτέ ἐστιν ἕτοιμος.

7:7 οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δὲ μισεῖ, ὅτι ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρά ἐστιν.

7:8 ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν· ταύτην ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται.

7:9 ταῦτα [δὲ] εἰπὼν αὐτὸς ἔμεινεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ. 7:10 Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ

7:11 οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ καὶ ἔλεγον, Ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος;

7:12 καὶ γογγυσμὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις· οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἀγαθός ἐστιν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, Οὔ, ἀλλὰ πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον.
7:13 οὐδεὶς μέντοι παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
7:14 Ἤδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσούσης ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐδίδασκεν.
7:15 ἐθαύμαζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες, Πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς;
7:16 ἀπεκρίθη [οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ] Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με·
7:17 ἐάν τις [θέλῃ] τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαλῶ.
7:18 ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ·
[ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν οὗτος ἀληθής ἐστι καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.][936]
7:19 οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον; καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον. τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι;
7:20 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ὄχλος, Δαιμόνιον ἔχεις· τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτεῖναι; 7:21 ἀπεκρίθη ο Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
Ἓν ἔργον ἐποίησα καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε.
7:22 διὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομήν οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστὶν ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε ἄνθρωπον.

Chapter Six

7:23 εἰ περιτομὴν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα ἐν σαββάτῳ;
7:24 μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνετε.

Chapter Seven[937]

Book Five

7:25 Ἔλεγον οὖν τινες ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν, Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν ζητοῦσιν ἀποκτεῖναι;
7:26 [καὶ] ἴδε παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσιν.

---

[936] Mentioned within the interpretation of the first half of Jn 7:18. Quoted in *In Jo.* 1.608.

[937] Chapter Seven is dedicated to continuing the explication of Jn 7:24.

μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;
7:27 ἀλλὰ τοῦτον οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται [οὐδεὶς γινώσκει] ὅταν ἔρχαται, πόθεν ἐστίν.
7:28 ἔκραξεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λέγων, Κἀμὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί·
καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με,
ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε· 7:29 ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν, ὅτι παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι κἀκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν.

Chapter One

7:30 Ἐζήτουν οὖν αὐτὸν πιάσαι Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν [ἐπ'] εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ.
7:31 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου [δὲ] οὖν πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν καὶ ἔλεγον, Ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ μὴ πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει ὧν οὗτος ἐποίησεν;
7:32 Ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα,
καὶ ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὑπηρέτας ἵνα πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.
7:33 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι καὶ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με.
7:34 ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ,
καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.
7:35 εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτούς, Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν; μὴ εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας;
7:36 [τίς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὃν εἶπεν, Ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ [με], καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;]
7:37 Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἑορτῆς τῇ μεγάλῃ εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων, Ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω.
7:38 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.

Chapter Two

7:39 τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος [ὃ] οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.
7:40 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκούσαντες τινες τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἔλεγον, Οὗ τός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης· 7:41 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ Χριστός,

οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον, Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; 7:42 οὐχ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυίδ καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυίδ ἔρχεται ὁ Χριστός;
7:43 σχίσμα οὖν ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ δι' αὐτόν·
7:44 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἤθελον πιάσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας.
7:45 Ἦλθον οὖν οἱ ὑπηρέται πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους, καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι, Διὰ τί οὐκ ἠγάγετε αὐτόν;
7:46 ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ὑπηρέται, Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος.
7:47 ἀπεκρίθησαν [οὖν] αὐτοῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπλάνησθε;
7:48 μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων; 7:49 ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπικατάρατοί εἰσιν.
7:50 λέγει πρὸς αὐτούς Νικόδημος , ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρότερον, εἷς ὢν ἐξ αὐτῶν, 7:51 Μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ πρῶτον παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ γνῷ τί ποιεῖ;
7:52 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται.
7:53 [[Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,
8:1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.
8:2 Ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.
8:3 ἄγουσιν δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι γυναῖκα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατειλημμένην, καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ
8:4 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ κατείληπται ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχευομένη·
8:5 ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθάζειν, σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις;
8:6 τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔχωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.
8:7 ὡς δὲ ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες αὐτόν, ἀνέκυψεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν πρῶτος ἐπ' αὐτὴν βαλέτω λίθον
8:8 καὶ πάλιν κατακύψας ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.
8:9 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐξήρχοντο εἷς καθ' εἷς ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ οὖσα.
8:10 ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Γύναι, ποῦ εἰσιν; οὐδείς σε κατέκρινεν;

8:11 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν, Οὐδείς, κύριε. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρίνω· πορεύου, [καὶ] ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε.]][938]
8:12 Πάλιν οὖν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου·
ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς.
8:13 εἶπον οὖν [αὐτῷ] οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, Σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς· ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής.
8:14 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Κἂν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία μου, ὅτι οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω·
ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἔρχομαι ἢ ποῦ ὑπάγω.
8:15 ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε, ἐγὼ [οὐ] κρίνω οὐδένα.
8:16 [καὶἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστιν, ὅτι μόνος οὐκ εἰμί, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.]
8:17 καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθής ἐστιν. 8:18 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.
8:19 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ σου;
ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου· εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἂν ᾔδειτε.

Chapter Three

8:20 Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπίασεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ.
8:21 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγὼ ὑπάγω καὶ ζητήσετέ με, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε·
καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.
8:22 [ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Μήτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτόν, ὅτι λέγει, Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;]
8:23 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί·

Chapter Four

ὑμεῖς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου ἐστέ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.
8:24 εἶπον οὖν ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν·
ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν.
8:25 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Σὺ τίς εἶ;

[938] Jn 7:53–8:11 is missing from Cyril's commentary.

εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;
8:26 πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν,
ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με ἀληθής ἐστι, κἀγὼ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
8:27 οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγε.
8:28 [εἶπεν οὖν [αὐτοῖς] ὁ Ἰησοῦς,]
Ὅταν ὑψώσητε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι,

Chapter Five

καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέ με ὁ πατὴρ ταῦτα λαλῶ.
8:29 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστι· καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκέ με μόνον,
ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε.
8:30 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν.
8:31 Ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους, Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταί μού ἐστε
8:32 καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς.
8:33 [ἀπεκρίθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν,]
Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐσμεν καὶ οὐδενὶ δεδουλεύκαμεν πώποτε· πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι Ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε;
8:34 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
8:35 ὁ [δὲ] δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
8:36 ἐὰν [οὖν] ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε.
8:37 οἶδα ὅτι σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐστε· ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.
8:38 ἐγὼ ἃ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε.
8:39 Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπαν , Ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν.
λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ [ἐστε] ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐποιεῖτε·ἄν 8:40 νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ· τοῦτο Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἐποίησε.
8:41 ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν.
εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννήμεθα· ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν.
8:42 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν [ἦν] εἴη, ἠγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμέ, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω·
[οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν.]

8:43 διὰ τί τὴν λαλιὰν τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκετε; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμόν.

Book Six

8:44 ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστὶν [ἦν] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ.

[ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ, ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ.

8:45 ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι.]

8:46 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας;

εἰ ἀλήθειαν λέγω, διὰ τί ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι;

8:47 ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.

8:48 Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ὅτι Σαμαρίτης εἶ σὺ καὶ δαιμόνιον ἔχεις;

8:49 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ δαιμόνιον οὐκ ἔχω, ἀλλὰ τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀτιμάζετέ με.

8:50 ἐγὼ [δὲ] οὐ ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου· ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων.

8:51 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον μου τηρῇ [τηρήσῃ], θάνατον οὐ μὴ [θεωρήσῃ] ἴδῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

8:52 εἶπον [οὖν] αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι δαιμόνιον ἔχεις. Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέθανε καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον, καὶ σὺ λέγεις, Ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, θανάτου οὐ μὴ γεύσηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

8:53 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανεν; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον· [τίνα σεαυτὸν ποιεῖς;][939]

8:54 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἐμαυτόν, ἡ δόξα μου οὐδέν ἐστι·

ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με,

ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστι, 8:55 καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν,

ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν. [κἂν] καὶ ἐὰν εἴπω ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, ἔσομαι ὅμοιος ὑμῖν ψεύστης·

ἀλλὰ οἶδα αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ.

8:56 Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη.

8:57 εἶπον οὖν [οἱ] Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας;

---

[939] The verse text is mentioned within the interpretation *In Jo.* 2.120.

8:58 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.
8:59 ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ' αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς [δὲ] ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ.
9:1 Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς.

Chapter One

9:2 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Ῥαββί, τίς ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ; 9:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.[940]
9:4 ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός [με] ἡμᾶς ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.
9:5 ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου.
9:6 ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπτυσε χαμαὶ καὶ ἐποίησε πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος καὶ ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς 9:7 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὕπαγε νίψαι τοῦ Σιλωάμ εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Ἀπεσταλμένος. ἀπῆλθεν οὖν καὶ ἐνίψατο καὶ ἦλθεν βλέπων.
9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν ἔλεγον, Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν; 9:9 ἄλλος ἔλεγον οὐχὶ, [ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν, ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, Οὐχί,] ἀλλ' ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι.
9:10 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Πῶς ἠνεῴχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί;
9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος, [Ὁ] ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησε καὶ ἐπέχρισέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπέ μοι ὅτι Ὕπαγε [καὶ] νίψαι εἰς τὸν Σιλωὰμ · ἀπελθὼν οὖν καὶ νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεψα.
9:12 καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος; λέγει, Οὐκ οἶδα.
9:13 Ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους τόν ποτε τυφλόν. 9:14 ἦν δὲ σάββατον ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν πηλὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέῳξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.
9:15 πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν.
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέ μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ ἐνιψάμην, καὶ βλέπω.
9:16 ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές, Οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ τηρεῖ.

---

[940] ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ was further reinterpreted on its own in *In Jo.* 2.148.

ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν; καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

9:17 λέγουσιν οὖν τῷ τυφλῷ πάλιν, Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι Προφήτης ἐστίν.

9:18 Οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν [οὖν] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος 9:19 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτοὺς λέγοντες, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς οὖν βλέπει ἄρτι;

9:20 ἀπεκρίθησαν [οὖν] οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπαν, Οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη· 9:21 πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἢ τίς [ἤνοιξεν] ἀνέῳξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδαμεν· αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει.

9:22 ταῦτα εἶπαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· ἤδη γὰρ συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν, αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται.

9:23 [διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπαν ὅτι Ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε.]

9:24 Ἐφώνησαν οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ δευτέρου ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν.

9:25 ἀπεκρίθη οὖν ἐκεῖνος, Εἰ ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν οὐκ οἶδα· ἓν οἶδα ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω.

9:26 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, πάλιν Τί ἐποίησέ σοι; πῶς [ἤνοιξέν] ἀνέῳξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;

9:27 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε· τί πάλιν θέλετε ἀκούειν;

μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;

9:28 καὶ ἐλοιδόρησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν, Σὺ μαθητὴς εἶ ἐκείνου, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐσμὲν μαθηταί·

9:29 ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν.

9:30 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τὸ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἐστί, καὶ ἤνοιξέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.

9:31 οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ᾖ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ τούτου ἀκούει.

9:32 ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου·

9:33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν.
9:34 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς; καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω.
9:35 Ἤκουσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω
καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν εἶπεν, Σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν [τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;] τοῦ Θεοῦ
9:36 [ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν,] Καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, φησὶν, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;
9:37 καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν.
9:38 ὁ δὲ [ἔφη,] εἶπε Πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν [αὐτῷ] αὐτόν.
9:39 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.
9:40 Ἤκουσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἐσμεν;
9:41 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν· νῦν δὲ λέγετε ὅτι Βλέπομεν, ἡ ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν [μένει] μενοῦσι.
10:1 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ λῃστής· 10:2 ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμήν ἐστιν τῶν προβάτων. 10:3 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά. 10:4 ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλῃ, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ· 10:5 ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν, ἀλλὰ φεύξονται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασιν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν.
10:6 Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.
10:7 Εἶπεν οὖν [πάλιν] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν [ὅτι] ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων.
10:8 πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λῃσταί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα.
10:9 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ σωθήσεται καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὑρήσει.
10:10 ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔρχεται εἰ μὴ ἵνα κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ· ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσι καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν.
10:11 Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός·
ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων· 10:12 ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν, οὗ οὐκ ἔστι τὰ πρόβατα

ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον καὶ ἀφίησι τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει 10:13 ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστι καὶ οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων.

10:14 Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός

καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσί με τὰ ἐμά, 10:15 καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα,

καὶ τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.

10:16 καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης· κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσι, καὶ γενήσονται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν.

10:17 διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ ὅτι [ἐγὼ] τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν [μου], ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν.

Book Seven[941]

10:18 οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ. ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν·

ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου.

10:19 Σχίσμα πάλιν ἐγένετο ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους. 10:20 ἔλεγον δὲ πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται· τί αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε; 10:21 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστι δαιμονιζομένου· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοῖξαι;

10:22 Ἐγένετο [τότε] δὲ τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν [τοῖς] Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ χειμὼν ἦν, 10:23 καὶ περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ στοᾷ [τοῦ] Σολομῶνος.

10:24 ἐκύκλωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, Ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις; εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, εἰπὲ ἡμῖν παρρησίᾳ.

10:25 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ·

10:26 ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε μοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν. 10:27 καθὼς δὲ εἶπον ὑμῖν, τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούουσι, κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτά καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, 10:28 κἀγὼ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

[941] Book Seven is collected from fragments; therefore the chapter division, and some verses, are missing from the available texts but not necessarily from Cyril's manuscript.

καὶ οὐχ ἁρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου. 10:29 ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέ μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστι, καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός. 10:30 ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν.

10:31 Ἐβάστασαν οὖν πάλιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λίθους, ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν.

10:32 [ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πολλὰ ἔργα καλὰ ἔδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός· διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον ἐμὲ λιθάζετε; 10:33 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι,]

Περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε ἀλλὰ περὶ βλασφημίας,

[καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν. 10:34 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι]

Ἐγὼ εἶπα, Θεοί ἐστε; καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

10:35 [εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή, 10:36 ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;]

10:37 εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετέ μοι· 10:38 εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύετε, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ [γινώσκητε] πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ [πατρί.]

10:39 [Ἐζήτουν [οὖν] αὐτὸν πάλιν πιάσαι, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.]

10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ. 10:41 καὶ πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐποίησεν σημεῖον οὐδέν, πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου ἀληθῆ ἦν. 10:42 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ.

11:1 Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς. 11:2 ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς, ἡς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος ἠσθένει.

11:3 ἀπέστειλαν οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσαι, Κύριε, ἴδε ὃν φιλεῖς ἀσθενεῖ.

11:4 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν,ἡ ἀσθένεια αὕτη οὐκ ἔστι οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς.

11:5 [ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον.]

11:6 ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ δύο ἡμέρας,

11:7 μετὰ δὲ [ἔπειτα] τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Ἄγωμεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν. 11:8 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, Ῥαββί,

νῦν ἐζήτουν σε λιθάσαι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λιθάσαι, καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ;
11:9 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐχὶ δώδεκα ὧραί εἰσι τῆς ἡμέρας; ἐάν οὖν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει· 11:10 ἐὰν δέ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ νυκτί, προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ.
11:11 ταῦτα εἶπε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς, Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται· ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν.
11:12 εἶπον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, Κύριε, εἰ κεκοίμηται σωθήσεται. 11:13 εἰρήκει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἔδοξαν ὅτι περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου λέγει.
11:14 τότε [οὖν] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς παρρησίᾳ, Λάζαρος ἀπέθανεν, 11:15 καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς ἵνα πιστεύσητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἤμην ἐκεῖ· ἀλλὰ ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν.
11:16 εἶπεν οὖν Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος τοῖς συμμαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ.
11:17 Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Βηθανίαν, εὗρεν αὐτὸν τέσσαρας ἤδη ἡμέρας ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ. 11:18 ἦν δὲ ἡ Βηθανία ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων [ὡς] ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε. 11:19 πολλοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐληλύθεισαν πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν Μαριὰμ ἵνα παραμυθήσωνται αὐτὰς περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν.
11:20 ἡ οὖν Μάρθα ὡς ἤκουσεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἔρχεται ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ· Μαριὰμ δὲ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐκαθέζετο.
11:21 εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου· 11:22 καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός. 11:23 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀναστήσεται ὁ ἀδελφός σου. 11:24 [λέγει] αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα, Οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται [ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει] ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
11:25 εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή· ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, 11:26 καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· πιστεύεις τοῦτο; 11:27 λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.
11:28 Καὶ ταῦτο εἰποῦσα ἀπῆλθε καὶ ἐφώνησε Μαριὰμ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς λάθρᾳ εἰποῦσα, Ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν καὶ φωνεῖ σε. 11:29 ἐκείνη δὲ ὡς ἤκουσεν ἠγέρθη [ταχὺ] καὶ ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν·
11:30 οὔπω δὲ ἐληλύθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν κώμην, ἀλλ' ἦν ἔτι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου [ὑπήντησεν] προσυπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα. 11:31 οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθούμενοι αὐτήν, ἰδόντες τὴν Μαριὰμ ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῇ δόξαντες ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ [μνημεῖον] μνῆμα ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ.

11:32 ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ ὡς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἔπεσε [αὐτοῦ] πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ λέγουσα [αὐτῷ], Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἄν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου.

11:33 οὖν Ἰησοῦς ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν· 11:34 καὶ εἶπε, Ποῦ τεθείκατε αὐτόν;

[λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. 11:35 ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.]

11:36 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἴδε πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν. 11:37 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον, Οὐκ ἐδύνατο οὗτος ὁ ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οὗτος μὴ ἀποθάνῃ;

11:38 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον· ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον καὶ λίθος ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ. 11:39 λέγει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἄρατε τὸν λίθον.

λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος Μάρθα, Κύριε, ἤδη ὄζει, τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι.

11:40 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὄψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ;

11:41 [ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον.] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἦρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπεν, Πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. 11:42 ἐγὼ δὲ ἤδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

11:43 καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασε, Λάζαρε, δεῦρο ἔξω. 11:44 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κειρίαις, καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο.

λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν.

11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαριὰμ καὶ θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν, ἐπίστευσαν ὁ Ἰσοῦς ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν· 11:46 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

11:47 συνήγαγον οὖν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συνέδριον καὶ ἔλεγον, Τί ποιοῦμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος σημεῖα πολλὰ ποιεῖ; 11:48 ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτως, πάντες πιστεύσουσιν εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος.

11:49 εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν, 11:50 οὐδὲ [λογίζεσθε] διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται. 11:51 τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου

ἐπροφήτευσεν ὅτι ἔμελλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνῄσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους, 11:52 καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἕν.

11:53 ἀπ' ἐκείνης οὖν τῆς [ἡμέρας] ὥρας συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν.

11:54 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔτι παρρησίᾳ περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν [εἰς τὴν χώραν] ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, εἰς Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν, [κἀκεῖ] καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμεινεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

11:55 Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβησαν πολλοὶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐκ τῆς χώρας πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα ἵνα ἁγνίσωσιν ἑαυτούς.

11:56 ἐζήτουν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἔλεγον μετ' ἀλλήλων ἑστηκότες ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ , Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; 11:57 ἐδεδώκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐντολὰς ἵνα ἐάν τις γνῷ ποῦ ἐστι μηνύσῃ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.

12:1 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὁ τεθνηκὼς ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν [Ἰησοῦς.] 12:2 ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει, ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος εἷς ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἀνακειμένων [σὺν] αὐτῷ.

Book Eight[942]

12:3 ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξεν ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.

12:4 λέγει [δὲ] Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι, 12:5 Διὰτί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη τριακοσίων δηναρίων καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; 12:6 εἶπε δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὅτι περὶ τῶν πτωχῶν ἔμελεν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ὅτι κλέπτης ἦν καὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον [ἔχων] εἶχε τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν. 12:7 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου [τηρήσῃ] τετήρκεν αὐτό· 12:8 τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

12:9 Ἔγνω οὖν [ὁ] ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐστι καὶ ἦλθον οὐ διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἴδωσιν ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

---

[942] Book Eight is also reconstructed from fragments; therefore, the chapter division is missing together with some verses, but not neccesarily from Cyril's manuscript

12:10 ἐβουλεύσαντο δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἀποκτείνωσιν,
12:11 ὅτι πολλοὶ δι' αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐπίστευον
εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
12:12 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἀκούσαντες
ὅτι ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα 12:13 ἔλαβον τὰ βαΐα τῶν
φοινίκων καὶ ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ [ἐκραύγαζον]
ἔκραζον λέγοντες, Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν
ὀνόματι κυρίου, [καὶ] [ὁ] βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
12:14 εὑρὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὀνάριον ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό, καθώς ἐστι
γεγραμμένον, 12:15 Μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς
σου ἔρχεται, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.
12:16 ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτου τὸ πρῶτον, ἀλλ' ὅτε
ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ
γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ.
12:17 ἐμαρτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅτε τὸν Λάζαρον
ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 12:18
διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο
αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον.
12:19 οἱ οὖν Φαρισαῖοι εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς, Θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε
οὐδέν· ἴδε ὁ κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν.
12:20 Ἦσαν δὲ Ἕλληνές τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα
προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ·
12:21 οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον Φιλίππῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,
καὶ [ἠρώτων] ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν
Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν. 12:22 ἔρχεται ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ,
ἔρχεται Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
12:23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκρίνατο αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα
δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
12:24 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν
γῆν ἀποθάνῃ, αὐτὸς μόνος μένει· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, πολὺν καρπὸν
φέρει.
12:25 ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ [ἀπολλύει] ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ
μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
φυλάξει αὐτήν.
12:26 ἐὰν ἐμοί τις διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθείτω,
καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται·
ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ.
12:27 Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται, καὶ τί εἴπω; Πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ
τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο [ἦλθον] εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην.
12:28 πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ [ὄνομα] υἱόν.
ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ [ἐκ τοῦ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, Καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω.

12:29 [ὁ οὖν ὄχλος ὁ ἑστὼς καὶ ἀκούσας ἔλεγεν βροντὴν γεγονέναι, ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, Ἄγγελος αὐτῷ λελάληκεν.]
12:30 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ δι' ἐμὲ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη γέγονεν ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς.
12:31 νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω·
12:32 κἀγὼ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς,ἑλκύσω πάντας πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.
12:33 τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν.
12:34 ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς [μένει] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;
12:35 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι. περιπατεῖτε ἕως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ· καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδεν ποῦ ὑπάγει.
12:36 ἕως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε.
Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἐκρύβη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.
12:37 Τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν,
12:38 ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου [τοῦ προφήτου] πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπε, Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; 12:39 διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν, ὅτι πάλαι Ἡσαΐας εἶπε , 12:40 Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσι, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.
12:41 [ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ.]
12:42 ὅμως μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὡμολόγουν ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται· 12:43 ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἤπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
12:44 Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν, Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμὲ ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με, 12:45 καὶ ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με.
12:46 ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ.
12:47 [καὶ ἐάν τίς μου ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ μὴ φυλάξῃ, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον.]
12:48 [ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ ῥήματά μου ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν·]

ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Book Nine

12:49 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν δέδωκεν τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω. 12:50 καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιός ἐστιν. ἃ οὖν ἐγὼ λαλῶ, καθὼς εἴρηκέ μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὕτως λαλῶ.

13:1 Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς.

13:2 καὶ δείπνου γινομένου, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος τοῦ Ἰσκαριώτου ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν, 13:3 εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει, 13:4 ἐγείρεται ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ λαβὼν λέντιον διέζωσεν ἑαυτόν· 13:5 εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ ἐκμάσσειν τῷ λεντίῳ ᾧ ἦν διεζωσμένος.

13:6 ἔρχεται οὖν [πρὸς] εἰς Σίμωνα Πέτρον· καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας; 13:7 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ σὺ οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι, γνώσῃ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα. 13:8 λέγει αὐτῷ Πέτρος, Οὐ μὴ νίψῃς μου τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, οὐκ ἔχεις μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ.

13:9 λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε, μὴ τοὺς πόδας μου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν.

13:10 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ χρείαν ἔχει εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι, ἀλλ' ἔστιν καθαρὸς ὅλος· καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πάντες. 13:11 ᾔδει γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντα αὐτόν· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὅτι Οὐχὶ πάντες καθαροί ἐστε.

13:12 Ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψε τοὺς πόδας [αὐτῶν] [καὶ] τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ ἔλαβε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνέπεσε πάλιν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γινώσκετε τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν; 13:13 ὑμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με Ὁ κύριος και Ὁ διδάσκαλος , καὶ καλῶς λέγετε, εἰμὶ γάρ. 13:14 εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας· 13:15 ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε.

13:16 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. 13:17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά.

13:18 οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τίνας ἐξελεξάμην· ἀλλ' Ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ Πληρωθῇ, Ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

13:19 ἀπάρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

13:20 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ λαμβάνων ἄν τινα πέμψω ἐμὲ λαμβάνει, ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων λαμβάνει τὸν πέμψαντά με.

13:21 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐμαρτύρησε καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με.

13:22 ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀπορούμενοι περὶ τίνος λέγει.

13:23 ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 13:24 νεύει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει. 13:25 ἀναπεσὼν [οὖν] δὲ ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν; 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ.

βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου. 13:27 καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς.

λέγει [οὖν] αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον. 13:28 τοῦτο δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τῶν ἀνακειμένων πρὸς τί εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

13:29 τινὲς [γὰρ] δὲ ἐδόκουν, ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν ὁ Ἰούδας, ὅτι [λέγει] εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἢ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἵνα τι δῷ.

13:30 λαβὼν [οὖν] δὲ τὸ ψωμίον [ἐκεῖνος] εὐθύς. ἐξῆλθεν ἦν δὲ νύξ.

13:31 Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ· 13:32 [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ] καὶ [ὁ θεὸς] αὐτὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν [αὐτῷ,] ἑαυτῷ καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν.

13:33 τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι·

ζητήσετέ με, καὶ καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις [ὅτι] Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι λέγω.

13:34 ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

13:35 ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε, ἐὰν ἀγάπᾶτε [ἔχητε ἐν] ἀλλήλους.

13:36 Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε, ποῦ ὑπάγεις;

ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον.

13:37 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, Κύριε, διατί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω.

13:38 ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.

14:1 Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία·
πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε.

14:2 ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν; 14:3 καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς [πρὸς ἐμαυτόν] μετ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε.

14:4 καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε καὶ τὴν ὁδόν οἴδατε.

14:5 Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς, [Κύριε,] οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· καὶ πῶς οἴδαμεν [δυνάμεθα] τὴν ὁδὸν [εἰδέναι;] 14:6 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ.

14:7 εἰ ἐγνώκατέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου [γνώσεσθε] ἄν ἤδειτε·
καὶ ἀπάρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἑωράκατε αὐτόν.

14:8 λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος, Κύριε, δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν.

14:9 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε; ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα·
[πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα;]

14:10 οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν;
τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ [λέγω ὑμῖν] λαλῶ ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ, ὁ [δὲ] πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα [αὐτοῦ.]

Chapter One

14:11 πιστεύετέ [μοι] ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί·ἐστιν
εἰ δὲ μή, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε.

14:12 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ κἀκεῖνος ποιήσει καὶ μείζονα τούτων ποιήσει, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι· 14:13 καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ·

14:14 ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ [με] ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.

14:15 Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς [τὰς ἐμὰς] μου τηρήσετε·

14:16 κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [ᾖ,] 14:17 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτό· ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.

14:18 Οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς, ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

14:19 ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με, ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε.
14:20 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὑμεῖς γνώσεσθε ὑμεῖς ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί μου καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν.

Book Ten

14:21 ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτὰς ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, κἀγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν.
14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, Κύριε, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ;
14:23 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα.
14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ·
καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.
14:25 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ᾽ ὑμῖν μένων· 14:26 ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον [ὑμῖν] ἐγώ.
14:27 Εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν· οὐ καθὼς ὁ κόσμος δίδωσιν ἐγὼ δίδωμι ὑμῖν. μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία μηδὲ δειλιάτω.
14:28 ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν, Ὑπάγω καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

Chapter One

εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με ἐχάρητε ἄν ὅτι πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ μου μείζων μού ἐστιν.
14:29 καὶ νῦν εἴρηκα ὑμῖν πρὶν γενέσθαι, ἵνα ὅταν γένηται πιστεύσητε.
14:30 οὐκέτι πολλὰ λαλήσω μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν, ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων· καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν, 14:31 ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα γνῷ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ καθὼς [ἐνετείλατο] ἐντολήν μοι δέδωκεν ὁ πατήρ, οὕτω ποιῶ.
Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.

Chapter Two

15:1 Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστιν.
15:2 πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπόν αἴρει αὐτό, καὶ πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον καθαίρει αὐτὸ ἵνα καρπὸν πλείονα φέρῃ.
15:3 ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν·

15:4 μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα οὐ δύναται φέρειν καρπὸν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐὰν μὴ μένῃ ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς ἐὰν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένητε.
15:5 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολύν, ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν. 15:6 ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα καὶ ἐξηράνθη καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ βάλλουσιν καὶ καίεται.
15:7 ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν.
15:8 ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε καὶ γένησθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.
15:9 καθὼς ἠγάπησέ με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς · μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. 15:10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μένετε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου, καθὼς κἀγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.
15:11 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν [ᾖ] μείνῃ καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.
15:12 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμή, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. 15:13 μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ.
15:14 ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε [ἃ] ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. 15:15 οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδε τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.
15:16 οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς καὶ [ἔθηκα] τέθεικα ὑμᾶς ἵνα [ὑμεῖς] ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένῃ, ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δῷ ὑμῖν.
15:17 [ταῦτα γάρ [ἐντέλλομαι] ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.][943]
15:18 Εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν μεμίσηκεν.
15:19 εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος.
15:20 μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν, Οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσι.

[943] Mentioned within the interpretation of verse seventeen *In Jo.* 2.584.

15:21 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι τὸν πέμψαντά με.
15:22 εἰ μὴ ἦλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν· νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.
15:23 ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου μισεῖ.
15:24 εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐποίησεν, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν· νῦν δὲ καὶ ἑωράκασι καὶ μεμισήκασι καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου.
15:25 ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος ὅτι Ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν.
15:26 Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· 15:27 καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε.
16:1 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε.
16:2 ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.
16:3 καὶ ταῦτα ποιήσουσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν πατέρα οὐδὲ ἐμέ.
16:4 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν.
Ταῦτα δὲ [ὑμῖν] ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην. 16:5 νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐρωτᾷ με, Ποῦ ὑπάγεις; 16:6 ἀλλ' ὅτι ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν.
16:7 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λέγω , συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα [ἐγὼ] ἀπέλθω. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος [οὐκ] οὐ μή ἔλθῃ [ἐλεύσεται] πρὸς ὑμᾶς·
[ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.]
16:8 καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως· 16:9 περὶ ἁμαρτίας μέν, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ· 16:10 περὶ δικαιοσύνης δέ, ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με· 16:11 περὶ κρίσεως δὲ , ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται.
16:12 Ἔτι πολλὰ ὑμῖν ἔχω λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι· 16:13 ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν [ἐν] [τῇ ἀληθείᾳ] τὴν ἀλήθειαν [πάσῃ]· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἄν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Book Eleven

Chapter One

16:14 ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Chapter Two

16:15 πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

16:16 Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με.

16:17 εἶπον οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν, Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; καί, Ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; 16:18 ἔλεγον οὖν, Τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει τὸ μικρόν; οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί λαλεῖ.

16:19 ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Περὶ τούτου ζητεῖτε μετ' ἀλλήλων ὅτι εἶπον, Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; 16:20 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, ὁ δὲ κόσμος χαρήσεται. ὑμεῖς λυπηθήσεσθε, ἀλλ' ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται.

16:21 ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτῃ λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς· ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 16:22 καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν λύπην μὲν νῦν [ἔχετε] ἕξετε· πάλιν δὲ ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἴρει ἀφ' ὑμῶν.

16:23 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα δώσει ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου. 16:24 ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ᾐτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου· αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

16:25 Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν· ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν.

16:26 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε, καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν· 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον.

16:28 ἐξῆλθον [παρὰ] ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

16:29 Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, Ἴδε νῦν ἐν παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖς καὶ παροιμίαν οὐδεμίαν λέγεις. 16:30 νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας

πάντα καὶ οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτᾷ· ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.

16:31 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς, Ἄρτι πιστεύετε; 16:32 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια κἀμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε· καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν.

16:33 ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην ἔχητε· ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλῖψιν ἔχετε, ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.

Chapter Three

17:1 Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶπε, Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν, ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς σου δοξάσῃ σέ,

Chapter Four

17:2 καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Chapter Five

17:3 αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή ἵνα γινώσκωσί σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

Chapter Six

17:4 ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω αὐτό· 17:5 καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί.

Chapter Seven

17:6 Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. σοὶ ἦσαν κἀμοὶ αὐτοὺς δέδωκας καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν. 17:7 νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν· 17:8 ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Chapter Eight

17:9 ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ, οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, ὅτι σοί εἰσιν, 17:10 καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστι καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά, καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς. 17:11 καὶ οὐκ ἔτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσὶ, κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι.

Chapter Nine

Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.

17:12 ὅτε ἤμην μετ' αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, καὶ ἐφύλαξα αὐτοὺς, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ. 17:13 νῦν δὲ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι

καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἵνα ἔχωσι τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

17:14 ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτούς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. 17:15 οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

17:16 ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶ καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

17:17 [ἁγίασον] Πάτερ ἅγιε τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν.

Chapter Ten

17:18 καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον· 17:19 καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὦσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

Chapter Eleven

17:20 Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ, 17:21 ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Chapter Twelve

17:22 κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν· 17:23 ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἠγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας.

17:24 Πάτερ, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ [κἀκεῖνοι] καὶ αὐτοὶ ὦσι μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἵνα θεωρῶσι τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι ὅτι ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

17:25 πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗ τοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας·

17:26 καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω, ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με ἐν αὐτοῖς ᾖ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

18:1 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Κεδρὼν ὅπου ἦν κῆπος, εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. 18:2 ᾔδει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον, ὅτι πολλάκις συνήχθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

18:3 ὁ οὖν Ἰούδας παραλαβὼν τὴν σπεῖραν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέτας ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων καὶ ὅπλων.

18:4 Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐξῆλθε καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τίνα ζητεῖτε; 18:5 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι. εἱστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν. 18:6 ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί.

18:7 πάλιν οὖν ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς, Τίνα ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. 18:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι· εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν· 18:9 ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι Οὓς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.

18:10 Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἔχων μάχαιραν εἵλκυσεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔπαισε τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δοῦλον καὶ ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ [ὠτάριον] ὠτίον τὸ δεξιόν· ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος.

18:11 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ, Βάλε τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὴν θήκην· αὐτῆς τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;

18:12 Ἡ οὖν σπεῖρα καὶ ὁ χιλίαρχος καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸν 18:13 καὶ ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Ἄνναν πρῶτον· ἦν γὰρ πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα, ὃς ἦν ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου· 18:14 ἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι συμφέρει ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.

18:15 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής.
ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος γνωστὸς ἦν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ καὶ συνεισῆλθε τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως,

18:16 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἱστήκει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὃς ἦν γνωστὸς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τὸν Πέτρον.

18:17 λέγει οὖν τῷ Πέτρῳ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρός, Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; λέγει ἐκεῖνος, Οὐκ εἰμί.

18:18 εἱστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἀνθρακιὰν πεποιηκότες, ὅτι ψῦχος ἦν, καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο· ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἑστὼς μετ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ θερμαινόμενος.

18:19 Ὁ οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἠρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ.
18:20 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ παρρησίᾳ λελάληκα τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐγὼ πάντοτε ἐδίδαξα ἐν συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου πάντες [οἱ] Ἰουδαῖοι συνέρχονται, καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν.
18:21 τί με ἐρωτᾷς; ἐρώτησον τοὺς ἀκηκοότας τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς· ἴδε οὗ τοι οἴδασιν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ.
18:22 ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος εἷς παρεστηκὼς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἔδωκε ῥάπισμα τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰπών αὐτῷ, Οὕτως ἀποκρίνῃ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ;
18:23 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ· εἰ δὲ καλῶς, τί με δέρεις;

Book Twelve

18:24 ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἅννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα. 18:25 Ἦν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος ἑστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος. εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ; ἠρνήσατο ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν, Οὐκ εἰμί. 18:26 λέγει εἷς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, συγγενὴς ὢν οὗ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον, Οὐκ ἐγώ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ; 18:27 πάλιν οὖν ἠρνήσατο Πέτρος, καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.
18:28 Ἄγουσιν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον· ἦν δὲ πρωΐ· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον, ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν ἀλλὰ φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα.
18:29 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ φησί, Τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;
18:30 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος [κακὸν ποιῶν] κακοποιὸς, οὐκ ἄν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν.
18:31 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτόν.
εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα· 18:32 ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπε σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν.
18:33 Εἰσῆλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ ἐφώνησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;
18:34 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις ἢ ἄλλοι εἶπόν σοι περὶ ἐμοῦ;
18:35 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Μήτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός εἰμι; τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκάν σε ἐμοί· τί ἐποίησας;
18:36 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἦν ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή, οἱ

ὑπηρέται οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο ἄν, ἵνα μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· νῦν δὲ ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐντεῦθεν.

18:37 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ;

ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι. ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· πᾶς ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς. 18:38 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια;

Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν πάλιν ἐξῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν. 18:39 ἔστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν ἵνα ἕνα δέσμιον ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ πάσχα· βούλεσθε οὖν ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν λέγοντες, Μὴ τοῦτον ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λῃστής.

19:1 Τότε οὖν ἔλαβεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐμαστίγωσε. 19:2 καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτόν 19:3 καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον, Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἐδίδοσαν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα.

19:4 Καὶ ἐξῆλθε πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἴδε ἄγω ὑμῖν αὐτὸν ἔξω, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ.

19:5 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω, φορῶν τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. 19:6 ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες, Σταύρωσον σταύρωσον.

λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Λάβετε ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρώσατε· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐχ εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν.

19:7 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν· καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐποίησεν.

19:8 Ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη, 19:9 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον πάλιν καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Πόθεν εἶ σύ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ.

19:10 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί [ἀπολῦσαί] σε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί σε;

19:11 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν^ οὐδεμίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν· διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει.

19:12 ἐκ τούτου ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἐζήτει αὐτόν ἀπολῦσαι · οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι [ἐκραύγασαν] ἔκραζον λέγοντες, Ἐὰν τοῦτον ἀπολύσῃς, οὐκ εἶ φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος· πᾶς ὁ βασιλέα ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι.

19:13 Ὁ οὖν Πιλᾶτος ἀκούσας τῶν λόγων τούτων ἤγαγεν ἔξω τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ βήματος εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον, Ἑβραϊστὶ δὲ Γαββαθα. 19:14 ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα ἦν ὡς<u>εὶ</u> ἕκτη. καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, Ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν.
19:15 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι, Ἆρον ἆρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Τὸν βασιλέα ὑμῶν σταυρώσω;
ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, Οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα.
19:16 τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.
Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, 19:17 καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον, ὃ λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθα, 19:18 ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους δύο ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν, μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
19:19 ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ· ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον· Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
19:20 τοῦτον οὖν τὸν τίτλον πολλοὶ ἀνέγνωσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν ὁ τόπος τῆς πόλεως ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί.
19:21 ἔλεγον οὖν τῷ Πιλάτῳ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Μὴ γράφε· Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν, Βασιλεύς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 19:22 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλᾶτος, Ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.
19:23 Οἱ οὖν στρατιῶται ὅτε ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἔλαβον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐποίησαν τέσσαρα μέρη, ἑκάστῳ στρατιώτῃ μέρος, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα. ἦν δὲ ὁ χιτὼν ἄραφος, ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑφαντὸς δι' ὅλου. 19:24 <u>εἶπον</u> οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ τίνος ἔσται· ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ ἡ λέγουσα· Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον. Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν.
19:25 εἱστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή.
19:26 Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἰδὼν τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὃν ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρί, Γύναι, ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου. 19:27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ, Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου. καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτὴν εἰς τὰ ἴδια.
19:28 Μετὰ τοῦτο<u>' Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν ἤδη ὅτι</u> [εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη] πάντα τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει, Διψῶ. 19:29 σκεῦος

ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν [τοῦ] ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

19:30 ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβε τὸ ὄξος ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, Τετέλεσται, καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.

19:31 Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν, ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου, ἠρώτησαν τὸν Πιλᾶτον ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη καὶ ἀρθῶσιν.

19:32 ἦλθον οὖν οἱ στρατιῶται καὶ τοῦ μὲν πρώτου κατέαξαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συσταυρωθέντος αὐτῷ· 19:33 ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες, ὡς εἶδον αὐτὸν ἤδη τεθνηκότα, οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη, 19:34 ἀλλ' εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξε, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ. 19:35 καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε. 19:36 ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἡ γραφή, Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 19:37 καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει, Ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.

19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησε τὸν Πιλᾶτον ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας, ὢν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεκρυμμένος δὲ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος. ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ ἦρεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

19:39 ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος, ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον, φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡσεὶ λίτρας ἑκατόν.

19:40 ἔλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων, καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφιάζειν. 19:41 ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη κῆπος, καὶ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μνημεῖον καινὸν ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἦν τεθειμένος·

19:42 ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον, ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

20:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρωὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου. 20:2 τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου, καὶ οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. 20:3 Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής, καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. 20:4 ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἦλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, 20:5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια, οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν. 20:6 ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν

εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα, 20:7 καὶ τὸ σουδάριον, ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐ μετὰ τῶν ὀθονίων κείμενον ἀλλὰ χωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἕνα τόπον. 20:8 τότε οὖν εἰσῆλθε καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς ὁ ἐλθὼν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐπίστευσεν· 20:9 οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὴν γραφὴν ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι.

20:10 ἀπῆλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί. 20:11 Μαρία δὲ εἱστήκει πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ ἔξω κλαίουσα.

ὡς οὖν ἔκλαιε, παρέκυψεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον 20:12 καὶ θεωρεῖ δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους, ἕνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἕνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν, ὅπου ἔκειτο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 20:13 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῇ ἐκεῖνοι, Γύναι, τί κλαίεις;

λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ἦραν τὸν κύριόν μου, καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. 20:14 ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστι.

20:15 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Γύναι, τί κλαίεις; τίνα ζητεῖς; ἐκείνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστι λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτόν, εἰπέ μοι ποῦ ἔθηκας αὐτόν, κἀγὼ ἀρῶ αὐτὸν .

20:16 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μαριάμ. στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥαββουνι ὃ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε, καὶ προσέδραμεν ἅψασθαι αὐτοῦ.

20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου·

Chapter One

πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν.

20:18 ἔρχεται Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι Ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον, καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ.

20:19 Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ οὐτοῦ συνηγμένοι διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν. 20:20 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ.

ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον.

20:21 [καὶ] εἶπεν [οὖν] αὐτοῖς [πάλιν], Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν· καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, κἀγὼ [πέμπω] ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς.

20:22 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησε καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον· 20:23 ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφέωνται αὐτοῖς, ἄν τινων κρατῆτε κεκράτηνται.

20:24 Θωμᾶς δὲ εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος, οὐκ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 20:25 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταί, Ἑωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων καὶ βάλω τὸν δάκτυλόν μου εἰς τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων καὶ βάλω μου τὴν χεῖρα εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω.

20:26 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν ἔσω ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ' αὐτῶν. ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν. 20:27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾷ, Φέρε τὸν δάκτυλόν σου ὧδε καὶ ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ φέρε τὴν χεῖρά σου καὶ βάλε εἰς τὴν πλευράν μου, καὶ μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός.

20:28 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς καὶ [εἶπεν] λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου.

20:29 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες.

20:30 Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ἃ οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

21:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος· ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ οὕτως. 21:2 ἦσαν ὁμοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. 21:3 λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος, Ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί. ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἐνέβησαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν. 21:4 πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης ἔστη Ἰησοῦς [εἰς] ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν, οὐ μέντοι [ᾔδεισαν] ἔγνωσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστι. 21:5 λέγει [οὖν] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε; ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, Οὔ. 21:6 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε. οἱ δὲ εἶπον δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι βαλοῦμεν. ἔβαλον οὖν, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὸ ἑλκύσαι ἴσχυον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων.

21:7 λέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὁ κύριός ἐστι. Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἀκούσας ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστι τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεζώσατο, ἦν γὰρ γυμνός, καὶ ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, 21:8 οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον, οὐ γὰρ

ἦσαν μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ ὡς ἀπὸ πηχῶν διακοσίων, σύροντες τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων. 21:9 ὡς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακιὰν κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον καὶ ἄρτον. 21:10 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν ἐπιάσατε νῦν. 21:11 ἀνέβη οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ εἵλκυσε τὸ δίκτυον εἰς τὴν γῆν μεστὸν ἰχθύων μεγάλων ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντατριῶν· καὶ τοσούτων ὄντων οὐκ ἐσχίσθη τὸ δίκτυον. 21:12 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν, Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν. 21:13 ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὀψάριον ὁμοίως. 21:14 τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν.

21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων; λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε, σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ, Βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου. 21:16 λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον, Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με; λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε, σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ, Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. 21:17 λέγει αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, Σίμων [Ἰωάννου] Ἰωνᾶ, φιλεῖς με; ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος ὅτι εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, Φιλεῖς με; καὶ [λέγει] εἶπεν αὐτῷ, συ οἶδας Κύριε, πάντα [σὺ οἶδας], σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

21:18 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτε ἦς νεώτερος, ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλοι ζώσουσί σε [ζώσει καὶ οἴσει] ὅπου οὐ θέλεις. 21:19 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.

21:20 Ἐπιστραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντα, ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν, Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδιδούς σε; 21:21 τοῦτον οὖν ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί; 21:22 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρὸς σέ; σύ μοι ἀκολούθει. 21:23 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν οὗτος ὁ λόγος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει. οὐκ εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει· ἀλλ', Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρὸς σέ;

21:24 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων ὁ και γράψας ταῦτα, καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία [ἐστίν].

21:25 Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία. ἀμήν.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources including translations:

Alla, Waheed H. "Discours pour la fête de la croix attribué à Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Oriens Christianus* Bd 75 (1991): 166–197.

Augustine. *Homilies on the Gospel of John*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Translated by John Gibb. NPNF, First series: vol. 7. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1995.

____. *In Johannis Evangelium Tractus*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Vol. 35. Paris: 1845.

Bindley, T. H. *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1950.

Bouriant, U. *Fragments coptes relatifs au concile d' Éphèse*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire. Vol. 8. Paris: 1892.

Chabot, J. B. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Vol. 70. Paris, 1912. Latin Translation by R. Tonneau, CSCO 140, Louvain: 1953.

Chaîne, P. M. "Sermon sur la pénitence attribué à saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie." In *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth* VI (1913): 493–519.

Charles, Robert Henry, ed. *The Chronicle of John, Coptic Bishop of Nikiu (c.690 A.D.) Being the History of Egypt Before and During the Arab Conquest*. Text and Translation Society, London, vol. 3. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1916.

Conybeare, Fred C., ed. *The Armenian Version of Revelation, Apocalypse of John Followed by Cyril of Alexandria's Scholia on the Incarnation and Epistle on Easter*. Text and Translation Society, London, vol. 5. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1907.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John by S. Cyril Archbishop of Alexandria*. Translated by P. E. Pussey. Vol. 1. A Library of the Holy Catholic Church, vol. 43. London: 1874.

_____. *Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John by S. Cyril of Alexandria*. Translated by T. Randell. Vol. 2. A Library of the Holy Catholic Church, vol. 48. London: 1885.

_____. *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. Studion, 1983.

_____. *A Commentary upon the Gospel According to S. Luke, by S. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. 2 vols. Oxford: At the University Press, 1859.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues Christologiques*. Edited and Translated by G. M. De Durand. SC, vol. 97. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1964.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Dialogues sur la Trinité*. Edited and Translated by G. M. De Durand. SC, vols. 231, 237, and 246. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976, 1977, 1978.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Contre Julien*. Vol. 1, SC, vol. 322. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1985.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres festales (I-VI)*. Intord. P. Évieux, texte W. H. Burns, trad. et notes L. Arragon, M. O. Boulnois, P. Évieux, M. Forrat, B. Meunier. SC, vol 372. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres festales (VII-XI)*. Texte W. H. Burns, Trad. et notes L. Arragon et R. Monnier, sous la direction de P. Evieux. SC, vol 392. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993.

_____. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres festales (XII-XVII)*. Texte W. H. Burns, trad. et notes Marie-Odile Boulnois et B. Meunier. SC, vol 434. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1998.

_____. Edited by Migne, J. P. Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca. Vols. 68–77. Paris: 1859.

_____. *Five Tomes against Nestorius: Scholia on the Incarnation: Christ is One: Fragments against Diodore of Tarsus: Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Synousiasts*. Translated by E. B. Pussey. The Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. Oxford: James Parker, 1881.

_____. "Homilia in s. Mariam uirginem." In *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the* Dialect *of Upper Egypt*, ed. E. A. W. Budge, 139–146 (Text), 717–724 (Translation). London: 1915.

_____. *Later Treatises of S. Athanasius Archbishop of Alexandria with Notes and an Appendix on S. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret*. Translated by E. B. Pussey. The Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. Oxford: James Parker, 1881.

_____. *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium. Accedunt Fragmenta varia necnon Tractatus Ad Tierium Diaconum*

Duo. Edited by P. E. Pussey. 3 vols. Bruxelles: Impression Anastatique Culture et Civilisation, 1965.

____. *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII* Prophetas. Edited by P. E. Pussey. 2 vols. Bruxelles: Impression Anastatique Culture et Civilisation, 1965.

____. *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini. Epistolae Tres Oecumenicae. Libri Quinque Contra Nestorium. XII Capitum Explanatio. XII Capitum Defensio Utraque. Scholia De Incarnatione Unigenti*. Edited by P. E. Pussey. Bruxelles: Impression Anastatique Culture et Civilisation, 1965.

____. *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini. De Recta Fide Ad Imperatorem. De Incarnatione Unigeniti Dialogus. De Recta Fide Ad Principissas. De Recta Fide Ad Augustas. Quod Unus Christus Dialogus. Apologeticus Ad Imperatorem*. Edited by P. E. Pussey. Bruxelles: Impression Anastatique Culture et Civilisation, 1965.

____. *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Letters*. Translated by John E. McEnerney. The Fathers of the Church, vols. 76 and 77. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1985.

____. *The Three Epistles of St. Cyril* (The Dogmatic Letters to Nestorius). Oxford: 1872.

Didymus the Blind. *De Spiritu Sancto. Traite du Saint-Esprit. Didyme l'Aveugle*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction notes et index, Louis Doutreleau. SC, vol. 386. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

Ebied, R. Y, and L. R. Wickham, eds. *A Collection of Unpublished Syriac Letters of Cyril of Alexandria*. CSCO. Vols. 359–360. Louvain: 1975.

____. "The Letter of Cyril of Alexandria to Tiberius the Deacon. Syriac Version." *Le Museon* 83 (1970): 433–482.

____. "An unknown Letter of Cyril of Alexandria in Syriac." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 22 (1971): 420–434.

Evetts, B., trans. *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*. Vol. 1, *Patrologia Orientalis*. Edited by R. Graffin and E. Nau. Paris: Librairie de Paris, 1907.

Grohmann, Adolf. "Die im Äthiopischen, Arabischen und Koptischen erhaltenen Visionen Apa Schenute's von Atripe. II. Die arabische Homilie des Cyrillus." Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 68 (1914): 1–46.

Geerard, Mauritti. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. 4 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–.

Heurtley, C. A. *On the Faith and The Creed. Dogmatic Teaching of the Church of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*. Oxford: 1886.

John Chrysostom. *In Iohannem homiliae*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca. Vol. 59. Paris: 1862.

McEnerney, J. I., trans. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters*. Fathers of the Church, vols. 76–77. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987.

McGuckin, J. A., trans. *St. Cyril of Alexandria On the Unity of Christ*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

Nestorius. *The Bazaar of Heracleides*. Edited and translated by G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925.

Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. Translated by Ronald Hiene. The Fathers of the Church, vols. 80 and 89. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989, 1993.

____.Origène: *Commentaire sur Saint Jean*. Edited and Translated by C. Blanc. SC vols. 120, 157 and 222. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, 1970, 1975.

Pharr, Clyde. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratio*. Text and translation by H. E. Butler, 4 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920–2.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson. *Ante-Nicene and Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers Series*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1995.

Schwartz, E. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. Concilium universale Ephesinum Bk. I. Vols. 1–5. Berlin/Leipzig: 1927–1930.

Severus Bishop of El-Ashmunien. *Al-Dur Al-Thamyn fy Idah Al-Dyn*. Cairo: Egypt, The New Bookstore, 1925.

Severus of Antioch. *Le florilège Cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d'Antioche*. Étude et édition critique par Robert Hespel. Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 37. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1955.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. *In Evangelium Joannis Commentarii Fragmenta (1)*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca. Vol. 66. Paris, 1864. 727–786.

Weischer, B. M. *Qerellos IV 1: Homilien und Briefe zum Konzil von Ephesos*. Wiesbaden: 1979.

Secondary sources:

"A *Sermon* on the Last Supper attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria." *St. Mark* (May 1999): 12–18.

Abel, F. M. "La géographie sacrée chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue Biblique* 31 (1922): 407–427.

____. "Parallélisme éxégetique entre S. Jérôme et S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Vivre et Penser. Recherches d'exégèse et d'histoire*, 1re série, 94–119, 212–30. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1941.

____. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la Palestine." In *Kyrilliana: Études variées à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*, 205–230. Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947.

Adshead, K. "Pharaoh and Patriarch: A Lexical Approach." In *Ancient History in a Modern University*, vol. 2, ed. T. Hillard, 350–356. *Cambridge*, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1998.

____ . "De Civitate Dei: le vocabulaire politique de Saint Cyrille D'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 78 (1990): 233–240.

Anastos, M. V. "Nestorius was orthodox." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 119–40.

Andersen, G. "The Integration of Platonism into Early Christian Theology." *Studia Patristica* 15 (1975): 399–414.

Armendariz, Luis M. *El Nuevo Moises*. Estudios Onienses Ser. 3, Vol.5. Madrid: Ediciones Fax, 1962.

Arzoumanian, Zaven. *Eznik of Kolb; Cyril of Alexandria; Constantine Porphyrogenitus*. New York: Diocese of the Armenian Church of America, 1976.

Aubineau, M. "Deux Homélies de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Analecta Bollandiana* 90 (1972): 100.

Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994.

Bagnall, R. S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Barkhuizen, J. H. "A Short Note on John 1:17 in Patristic Exegesis." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 8 (1997):18–25.

Batiffol, P. "Les Présents de Saint Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople." *Études de Liturgie et d'Archéologie Chrétienne*. Paris: J. Gabalda, (1919): 154–76.

____. "Un épisode du concile d'Ephèse (juillet 431) d'après les actes copte de Bouriant." In *Mélanges* offerts G. Schlümberger, vol. 1, 28–39. Paris: 1924.

Bebis, George S. *The Mind of the Fathers*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1994.

Beck, Hans-Georg. *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.

Bell, H. I. *Jews and Christians in Egypt: The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy*. Oxford University Press, 1924.

Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

Berthold, G. C. "Cyril of Alexandria and the Filioque." Studia Patristica 19 (1989): 143–47.

Bethune-Baker, J. F. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*. London: Methuen, 1962.

Bettazzi, Don Luigi. *Miracolo e Fede in S. Cirillo d'Alessandria*. Roma: Marietti, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1951.

Bettenson, Henry. *The Later Christian Fathers: A Selection from the Writings of the Fathers from St. Cyril of Jerusalem to St. Leo the Great*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Blair, H. A. "Allegory, Typology and Archetypes." *Studia Patristica* 17/1 (1982): 263–68.

Blanchette, O. "Saint Cyril of Alexandria's Idea of the Redemption." *Sciences Ecclésiastique* 16 (1964): 455–80.

Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of* Manna *in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

Boulnois, Marie Odile. *Le paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes. Collections des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 143 (1994).

____. "Liberté et théodicée selon Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 378–388.

____. "Platon entre Moïse et Arius selon le *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997): 264–71.

_____ . "L'eucharistie, mystère d'union chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Les modéles d'union Trinitaire et Christologique." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 74 (2000): 147–172.

Bovon, François. "From St. Luke to St. Thomas by Way of St. Cyril." In *Studies in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Backer Academic, 2005.

Brakke, David. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford and New York: 1995.

Bright, W. "Saint Cyril of Alexandria." *Dictionary of Christian* Biography, vol. 1. 763–773.

Brock, S. P. "Origen's aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament." *Studia Patristica* 10 (1970): 215–218.

Brown, Peter. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

Brown, R. A. *The Gospel According to John*. The Anchor Bible, vols. 29 and 29A. New Doubleday, 1966.

Browning, Robert. *Education in the Roman Empire*. The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. Avril Cameron, vol. 14, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Bultmann, R. *The Gospel of John. A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Burghardt, Walter J. *The Image of God in Man According to Cyril of* Alexandria. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1957.

____. "Cyril of Alexandria on 'Wool and Linen.'" *Traditio* 2 (1944): 484–86.

Burns, W. H. "The Festal Letters of Saint Cyril of Alexandria." Ph.D. Diss., Southampton: 1988.

Burton-Christie, Douglas. *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Cameron, Avril. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Cassel, J. D. "Cyril of Alexandria and the science of the grammarians: a study in the setting, purpose and emphasis of Cyril's Commentary on Isaiah." Ph.D. diss., Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1992.

____. "Key Principles in Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis." *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 413–420.

____. "Cyril of Alexandria as Educator." In *In Dominico Eloquio: In Lordly Eloquence*, eds. Paul Blowers, Angela Russell Christman, David G. Hunter, and Robin Darling Young, 348–68. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.

Casurella, Anthony. *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Cattaneo, E. "Formule di fede nelle *Lettere Pasquali* di Cirillo d'Alessandria." *Koinonia* 7 (1983): 31–5.

Chadwick, H. "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 2 (1951): 145–64.

Charlier N. "La doctrine sur le Saint Esprit dans le 'Thesaurus' de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia Patristica* II Berlin (1957): 187–193.

____. "Le Thesaurus de Trinitate de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 45 (1950): 25–81.

Chestnut, R. C. "The Two Prosopa in Nestorius' *Bazaar of Heracleides*." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 29 (1978): 392–408.

Chuvin P. *A Chronicle of the Last Pagan*. Translated by B. A. Archer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Clark, Donald Lemen. *Rhetoric in the Greco-Roman Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind, Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Cross, F. L. and E. A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1998.

____. "The Projected Lexicon of Patristic Greek." In *Actes du VIe Congrès* International *d'Études Byzantines*, 389–392. Paris: 1950.

Crouzel, Henri. *Origen*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

D'Ales, A. "Le symbole d'union de 433." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 3 (1931): 257–268.

____. "Le Concile d'Ephèse." *Gregorianum* 12 (1981):200–266.

Daniélou, J. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1987.

____. *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1973.

____. *Sacramentum futuri. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*. Paris: 1950.

____. *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*. Westminster, Md., 1960.

____. "The Problem of Symbolism." *Thought* 25 (1950):422–44.

Darrouzès, J. *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'Église Byzantine*. Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 11. Paris: Institute Français d'Études Byzantines, 1970.

Datema, C. "Classical quotations in the work of Cyril of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 17/1 (1982): 422–5.

Davids, Adalbert. "Cyril of Alexandria's First Episcopal Years." In *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*, eds. J. den Boeft and M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk, 187–202. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

De Durand, G. M. "Les trois fêtes." *Théologie Historique* 88 (1992): 103–117.

____. "Une Lettre méconnue de Cyrille d'Alexandrie." In Alexandrina: *Mélanges offèrts à C. Mondésert*. Les Éditions du Cerf: Paris, 1987.

____. "Un prologue inédit au *De adoratione* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie?" *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 3–7.

De Halleux, A. "Cyrille, Théodoret et le 'Filioque.'" *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 74 (1979): 597–625.

____. "'Hypostase' et 'personne' dans la Formation du dogme *trinitaire* ca. 375–391." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 79 (1984): 314–69; 625–70.

____. "Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430–433)." *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992): 425–58.

____. "La *première* session du Concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993): 48–87.

____. "*Nestorius*, histoire et doctrine." *Irénikon* 56 (1993b): 38–51, 163–77.

De Juaye, *Hubert du Manoir. Dogme et Spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*. Paris: 1944.

De Lubac, *Henri. Medieval Exegesis, vol 1: The Four Senses of Scripture*. Translated by Mark Sebanc. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

De Margerie, Bernard. "L'exégèse christologique de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 102 (1980): 400–425.

____. "Saint Cyril of Alexandria Develops a Christocentric Exegesis." In *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis*. Translated by Leonard Maluf, vol. 1, 241–73. Petersham, Mass.: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993.

Den Heijer, Johannes. *Mawhub Ibn Mansur Mufarrig et l'historiographie copto-arabe: Étude sur la composition de l'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie*. CSCO 83. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

Devreesse, Robert. "Les actes du concile d'Ephèse." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 18 (1929): 223–242, 408–431.

____. "Après le concile d'Ephèse. Le retour des Orientaux à l'unité." *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939): 271–92.

Dewart, J. M. *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington D.C.: 1971.

Diepen, H. M. *Aux Origines de l'anthropologie de Saint Cyrille* d'Alexandrie. Paris: 1957.

____. "La christologie de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'anthropologie néo-platonicienne." *Euntes Docete* 9 (1956): 20–63.

____. "Les Douze Anathématismes au Concile d'Ephèse et jusqu'en 519." *Revue Thomiste* 55 (1955): 300–38.

____. "Stratagèmes contre la théologie de l'Emmanuel. À propos d'une nouvelle comparaison entre S. Cyrille et Apollinaire." *Divinitas* 1 (1957): 444–478.

Dillon, J. *The Middle Platonists*. London: Duckworth, 1977.

Discroll, Jeremy. "Exegetical Procedures in the Desert Monk Poemen." *Studia Anselmiana* 116 (1995): 155–178.

Dragas G. D. *St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*. Church and Theology vol. 6. Athens: 1985.

____. "'St Athanasius' Two Treatise *Contra Apollinarem*." *Abba Salama* 6 (1974): 84–96.

____. "A note concerning Athanasius' soteriology." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 61 (1979): 210–220.

Draguet, R. "Pour l'édition du Philalèthe de Sévère d'Antioche." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30: 274–9.

Dratsellas, C. *Questions of the soteriological teaching of the Greek Fathers with special reference to St. Cyril of Alexandria*. Athens: 1967–1968.

____. *Man in his Original State and in the State of Sin According to Cyril of Alexandria*. Athens: 1970–1971.

____. "Questions on Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria." *Abba* Salama 6 (1974): 203–232.

Drioton, Etienne. "Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'ancienne religion égyptienne." In *Kyrilliana: Études variées à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*, 231–46. Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947.

Dubarle, A. M. "Les conditions du salut avant la venue du Sauveur chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 32 (1948): 359–62.

____. "L'ignorance du Christ dans S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 16 (1939): 111–120.

Du Manoir, H. "L'argumentation patristique dans la controverse nestorienne." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 25 (1935): 441–461, 531–560.

____. *Dogme et Spiritualité chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1944.

____. "L' Église Corps du Christ chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." Gregorianum 19 (1938): 573–603; 20 (1939): 83–100, 161–88.

____. "Le problème de Dieu chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie." Recherches *de Science Religieuse* 27 (1937): 385–407.

____. "Les premiers versets du quatrième évangile commentés par Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia mediaevalia et mariologica*. Rome: Ed Antonianum (1971): 101–19.

____. "Le Symbole de Nicée au concile d'Ephèse." *Gregorianum* 12 (1931): 104–37.

Dupré la Tour, A. "La doxa du Christ dans les oeuvres exégétiques de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 48 (1960): 521–43; 49 (1961): 68–94.

Dzielska, M. *Hypatia of Alexandria*. Translated by F. Lyra. Revealing Antiquity 8, ed. G. W. Bowersock. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Ebeid, Rifaat. Y. and Wickham, L. R. "Timothy Aelurus: Against the Council of Chalcedon." In C. Lage *et al.*, eds, *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 18 (1985): 115–66.

Eberle, A. *Die Mariologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*. Freiburg: 1921.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature: The New Testament in the Greek Fathers, ed. Gordon D. Fee, Number 1. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986.

____. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origin*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992.

____. "The use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism." *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Early Church History*. Kampen: Pharos, 1994, 118–135.

Elliott, James Keith. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Fatica, L. *I commentari a Giovanni di Teodoro di Mopsuestia e di Cirillo di Alessandria. Confronto fra metodi esegetici et teologici*. Rome: Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum, 29, 1988.

Fee, Gordon D. "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria. A contribution of Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Editions." *Biblica* 52 (1971): 357–394.

____. "The Text of John and Mark in the writings of Chrysostom:" *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 525–547.

Fernández, Lois, A. H. A. *La cristologia en los commentarios a Isaias de Cirilo de Alejandria y Teodoreto de Ciro*. Rome: Ponticia Universitas Lateranensis, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1998.

Festugière, A. J., trans. *Éphèse et Chalcédoine. Actes des Conciles*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1982.

Finan, Thomas and Vincent Twomey, eds. *Scriptural Interpretation in the Fathers: Letter and Spirit*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995.

Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Fink, John F. "Saint Cyril of Alexandria." In *The Doctors of the Church: An Introduction to the Church's Great Teachers*. New York: Alba House, 2000.

Fowden, G. "Bishops and Temples in the Eastern Roman Empire 320–425 AD." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 29 (1978): 53–78.

Fraigneau-Julien, B. "L'efficacité de l'humanité du Christ selon S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue Thomiste* 55 (1955): 615–28.

____. "L'inhabitation de la sainte Trinité dans l'âme selon S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 30 (1956): 135–156.

____. "Un traité anonyme de la S. Trinité attribué à S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 49 (1961): 188–211, 386–405.

Franses, D. "Cyrille au Concile d'Ephèse." *Studia Catholica* 7 (1931): 369–398.

Frend, W. H. C. "Monks and the End of Greco-Roman Paganism in Syria and Egypt." *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 11, part 3. (1990): 469–84.

____. "Popular religion and christological controversy in the Fifth Century." *Studies in Church History* 8 (1972): 19–29.

____. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: 1984.

____. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972.

Froehlich, Karfried. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. Sources of Early Christian Thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Galtier, P. "Le Centenaire d'Ephèse." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 21 (1931): 169–99, 269–98.

____. "Les anathématismes de S. Cyrille et le Concile de Chalcédoine." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 23 (1933): 45–57.

____. *L'Unité du Christ*. Paris: 1939.

____. "Unité ontologique et unité psychologique dans le Christ." *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 42 (1941): 161–175, 216–232.

____. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Saint Léon le Grand à Chalcédoine." In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, vol. 1, 345–87. Würzburg, 1951–2.

____. "Saint Cyrille et Apollinaire." *Gregorianum* 37 (1956): 584–609.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gaudel, A. "Kenose." In *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* 8 (1925): 2339–2349.

Gebremedhin, E. *Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1977.

Gero, Stephen. "Cyril of Alexandria, image worship, and the vita of Rabban Hormizd." *Oriens Christianus* (1978): 77–97.

Giudici, Giovanni. *La Dottrina Della Grazia nel commento alla Lettera ai Romani di S. Cirillo di Al.* Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1951.

Gleason, Maud. "Visiting and News: Gossip and Reputation-Management in the Desert." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6:3 (Fall 1998): 501–521.

Globe, Alexander. "Serapion of Thmuis as witness to the Gospel text used by Origen in Caesarea:[Complete list of quotes from Gospels; lists of variants; tables]" *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 97–127.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.

Gould, Graham. "Cyril of Alexandria and the Formula of Reunion." *Downside Review* 106 (1988): 235–52.

Grant, R. M. "Greek Literature in the Treatise *De Trinitate* and Cyril's *Contra Julianum*." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 15 (1964): 265–99.

____. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1957.

____ and David Tracey. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. Fortress Press, 1984.

Gray, P. T. R. *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 20. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Greer, Rowan A. *The Captain of our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1973.

____. *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian*. London: The Faith Press, 1961.

Gregory T. E. *Vox Populi. Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the fifth century AD*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1979.

Grillmeier, A. *Christ in the Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*. Translated by John Bowden. Vol. 1. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Grillmeier, A., and H. Bacht, eds. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 3 vols. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1951–2.

Gross, J. *La divinisation du chrétien d'après les Pères grecs: contribution historique à la doctrine de grace*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1938.

____. *The Divinization of the Christian according to the Greek Fathers*. Translated by Paul A. Onica. Anaheim, California: A&C Press, 2002.

Guillet, J. "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche. Conflict ou malentendu?" *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 34 (1947): 257–302.

Hall, Christopher A. *Reading Scripture with the Church Fathers*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Hallman, Joseph M. "The Seed of Fire: Divine Suffering in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius of Constantinople." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997): 369–91.

Hanson, R. C. P. *Allegory and Event*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959.

Hardy, E. R. *Christian Egypt: Church and People*. New York: 1952.

____. "The further Education of Cyril of Alexandria (412–444). Questions and Problems." *Studia Patristica* 17/1. (1982): 116–22.

Haring, N. M. "The character and range of influence of St. Cyril of Alexandria on Latin Theology, 430–1260." *Medieval Studies* 12 (1950): 1–19.

Hart, David. "No Shadow of Turning: On Divine Impassibility." *Pro Ecclesia* vol. 11. No.2 (Spring 2002): 184–206.

Hatch, Edwin. *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957.

Hausherr, Irénée. *Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East*. Translated by Anthony P. Gythiel. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1990.

Hawthorne, Gerald, ed. *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic* Interpretation. Eerdmans, 1975.

Heath, Malcolm. "Invention." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 89–119. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Hebensperger, J. N. *Die Denkwelt des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien. Ein analyse ihres philosphischen Ertrags*. Augsburg: 1927.

Hefele, Charles, J. *A History of the Councils of the Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1883.

Holder, Arthur. "The Mosaic Tabernacle in Early Christian Exegesis." *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993): 101–106.

Hollerich, M. J. *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah. Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Holum, K. *Theodosian Empress: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Houdek, Francis Joseph. "Contemplation in the Life and Works of Saint Cyril of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1979.

Hughes, Philip. *The Church in Crisis. A History of the General Councils 325–1870*. Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1961.

Imhof, P. and B. Lorenz. *Maria Theotokos bei Cyrill von Alexandrien*. München: 1981.

Jaeger, Werner, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Janssens, L. "Notre filiation divine d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." Ephemerides *Theologicae Lovanienses* 15 (1938): 233–78.

Jennings, Willie James. "Undoing Our Abandonment: Reading Scripture Through the Sinlessness of Jesus: A Meditation on Cyril of Alexandria's On the Unity of Christ." *Ex Auditu* 14 (1998): 85–96.

Johnson, D. W. "Coptic Sources of the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C., 1974.

____. "Further Remarks on the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria." *OC* 61 (1977): 103–116.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602*. 2 vols. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Jorgensen, John S., ed. and trans. "A Sermon on Penitence attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria." *Coptic Church Review* 9 (1988): 9–14, 45–49.

Jouassard, G. "L'Abandon du Christ en croix dans la tradition grecque des IVe et Ve siècles." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 5 (1925):609–33.

____. "Cyril von Alexandrien." *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 3, 499–516.

____. . "Impassibilité du Logos et impassibilité de l'âme humaine chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 45 (1957): 209–244.

____. "La date des écrits antiariens de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie."*Revue Bénédictine* 87, Maresouds (1977): 172–78.

____. "L'activité littéraire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie jusqu'à 428." *Mélanges E. Podechard*. Lyons: Facultes Catholiques (1945): 159–174.

____. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie aux prises avec la "communication des idiomes" avant 428 dans ses ouvrages Anti-ariens." *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962) Berlin: 112–121.

____. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le schema de l'incarnation Verbe-Chair." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 44 (1956): 234–242.

____. "Un problème d'anthropologie et de christologie chez S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 43 (1955): 361–378.

____. "Une intuition fondamentale de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie en christologie dans les premières années de son épiscopat. *Revue des Études Byzantines* 11 (1953): 175–186.

Jugie, Martin. "La Terminologie christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Echos d'Orient* 15 (1912): 12–27.

Kakosy, Laszlo. "A Christian Interpretation of the Sun Disk." In *Studies in Egyptian Religion*, ed. M. Van Voss, 70–75. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Kalantzis, George. "The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia as expressed in the Greek fragments of his 'Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis Apostoli." Ph.D. Diss., Northwestern University, 1997.

Kannengiesser, C. "Athanasius of Alexandria and the foundation of traditional Christology." In *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians*. Great Britain: Variorum, 1991.

____. "Athanasius von Alexandrien als Exeget." *Stimuli*. Munster, Germany: Aschendorff, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband; 23 (1996): 336–343.

____. "The Bible as Read in the Early Church: Patristic Exegesis and its Presuppositions." In *The Bible and its Readers*. London: SCM, 1991, 29–36.

Kaster, R. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Kearsley, Roy. "The Impact of Greek Concepts of God on the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria." *Tyndale Bulletin* 43 (1992): 307–29.

Keating, Daniel. "The Baptism of Jesus in Cyril of Alexandria: The Re-creation of the Human Race." *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 201–222.

____. "The Twofold Manner of Divine Indwelling in Cyril of Alexandria: Redressing an Imbalance." *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 543–549.

____. *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 1978.

____. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963.

____. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.

____. "The Genres of Rhetoric." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 43–50. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

____. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.

____. "Historical Survey of Rhetoric." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 3–41. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

____. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

____. *Quintilian*. New York: Twayne, 1969.

Kerrigan, A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament*. Rome, Institutum Pontificum Biblicum, 1952.

____. "The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses of the New Testament according to St. Cyril of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 1 (63), Berlin (1957): 354–74.

Kesich, Veselin. "Hypostatic and Prosopic Union in the Exegesis of Christ's Temptation." *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1965): 118–37.

Koen, Lars. "Partitive Exegesis of Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John." *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993): 115–121.

____. *The Saving Passion. Incarnational and Soteriological Thought in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Studia Doctrinae Christianae Upsaliensia, 31. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1991.

Kolp A. L. "Partakers of the Divine Nature. The Use of II Peter 1:4 by *Athanasius*." *Studia Patristica* XVII-3. Oxford (1982): 1018–1023.

Kopallik, J. *Cyrillus von Alexandrien: eine Biographie nach den Quellen gearbeitet*. Mayence: 1881.

____. *Kyrilliana: Études variées à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie (444–1944)*. Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947.

Labelle, J. M. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie: témoin de la langue et de la pensée philosophiques au Ve siècle." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 52 (1978): 135–158; 53 (1979): 23–42.

Ladner, Gerhart B. *The Idea of Reform*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967.

Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1994.

Langevin, G. "Le Thème de l'incorruptibilité dans le commentaire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l'évangile selon saint Jean." *Science ecclésiastiques* 8 (1956): 295–316.

____. "La Doxa du Christ dans Cyrille." *Recherches de Science Religeuse* 39 (1961): 69–94.

Lavaud, B. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie: court traité contre ceux qui ne veulent pas reconnaître Marie Mère de Dieu." *Revue Thomiste* 56 (1956): 688–712.

Lebon, J. *Le monophysisme Séverien*. Louvain: 1909.

____. "La christologie du monophysisme syrien." In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, ed. A. Grillmeier, vol. 1, 425–580. Wüzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1951.

Lebourlier, J. "Union selon l'hypostase: ébauche de la formule dans le premier livre pseudo-athanasien Contre Apollinaire." *Revue des Sciences Philosphiques et Théologiques* 44 (1960): 470–476.

Leclercq, H. "Lecteur." In *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 1929.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.

Liébaert, J. *La doctrine christologique de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne*. Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1951.

____. "L'évolution de la christologie de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie à partir de la controverse nestorienne (428–429)." *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 27 (1970): 27–48.

____. *L'Incarnation*. Vol. 1, Des Origines au Concile de Chalcédoine. Paris: 1966.

____. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et la culture antique." *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 12 (1955): 5–26.

____. *S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'Arianisme: Les sources et la doctrine christologique du Thesaurus et des Dialogues sur La Trinité*. Lille: 1948.

Lieu, J. *Image and Reality. The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Lim, Richard. *Public Disputations, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Limberis, V. *Divine Heiress. The Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Löhr, Winrich. "The Theft of the Greeks: Christian Self Definition in the Age of the Schools." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 95.3 (2000): 403–26.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Loofs, Friedrich Arnim. *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben*. Halle: Miemeyer, 1905.

Löss, Josef. "One as the Same: Elements of an Ethiopian Christology." *Ostkirchlichen Studien* 42, no. 4 (1993): 288–302.

Louth, A. "Reason and Revelation in S. Athanasius." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970): 385–396.

____. "The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' *Contra Gentes – De Incarnatione*." *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 227–31.

____. "The use of the term 'idios' in Alexandrian theology from Alexander to Cyril." *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 198–202.

Lynch, J. J. "Leontius Byzantium: A Cyrillian Christology." *Theological Studies* 36 (1975): 455–471.

Lyonnet, S. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et 2 Cor 3:17." *Biblica* 32 (1951): 25–31.

MacCoull, Leslie S. B. "Pierpont Morgan MS. Copt. 591: The Apocalypse Commentary of Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 33–39.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship, ed. Dan O. Via. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

MacLead, Roy, ed. *The Library of Alexandria*. Centre of Learning in the Ancient World. London, New York: L. B. Tauris, 2000.

Mahé, J. "Les anathématismes de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et les évêques orientaux du patriarchat d'Antioche." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 7 (1906): 505–42.

____. "La date du Commentaire de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l'Evangile selon S. Jean." *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 8 (1907): 41–5.

____. "L'Eucharistie d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 8 (1907): 677–696.

____. "La sanctification d'après S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Revue d'Histoire Écclésiastique* 10 (1909): 30–40, 469–92.

Mahien, L. "L'abandon du Christ sur la croix." *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 2 (1945): 209–42.

Malley, William. J. *Hellenism and Christianity: The Conflict between Hellenic and Christian Wisdom in the "Contra Galilaeos" of Julian the Apostate and the "Contra Julianum" of St. Cyril of Alexandria*. Rome: Università Gregoriana, 1978.

____. "The Contra Julianum of St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Peter Canisius." *Theological Studies* 25 (1964): 70–74.

Marcovich, Miroslav. *Patristic Textual Criticism: Part 1*, vol. 1. Scholars Press, 1994.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G. Lamb. London: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Matta-El-Meskeen. *Coptic Monasticism in the Age of St. Macarius*. Nitrean Desert: Monastery of St. Macarius Press, 1984.

Mazur, G. O. "Introduction to St. Cyril of Alexandria's Commentaries on the Fourth Gospel: Preface, Chapter I-II." *Orthodox Life,* no. 49 (1999): 17–29.

McCoy, J. D. "Philosophical Influences on the Doctrine of the Incarnation in Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria." *Encounter* 38 (1977): 362–391.

McGuckin, John. "Christian Asceticism and the Early School of Alexandria." *Studies in Church History*, vol. 22 (1985): 25–39.

____. "The Concept of Orthodoxy in Ancient Christianity." *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 8,1 (1989): 5–23.

____. "The influence of the Isis Cult on St. Cyril of Alexandria's Christology." *Studia Patristica* 24 (1992): 191–9.

____. "Homily on the Feast of St. John the Theologian." *Sourozh* no. 51 (1993): 34–35.

____. "Moses and the 'Mystery of Christ' in St. Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis." *Coptic Church Review* 21 (2000): 24–32; 98–114.

____. "Nestorius and the political factions of the fifth-century Byzantium: factors in his personal downfall." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 78, part 3 (1996): 7–21.
____. "Origen on the Jews." *Studies in Church History*, vol. 29 (1992): 1–13.
____. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology, and Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
____. "A Synopsis of St. Cyril's Christological Doctrine." *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998): 42–51.
____. "The 'Theopaschite Confession' (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Re-interpretation of Chalcedon." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984): 239–55.
____. *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition*. New York: 1987.
McInerney, J. L. "Soteriological Commonplaces in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on John." In *Disciplina Nostra*, ed. D. F. Winslow, 179–85. Philadelphia: 1979.
McKenzie. "The Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on John." *Theological Studies* 14 (1953): 73–83.
McKinion, Steven A. *Words, Imagery and the Mystery of Christ: A Reconstruction of Cyril of Alexandria's Christology*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
McLead, Fredrick G. *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
Mehlmann, John. "John 8:48 in some Patristic Quotations." *Biblica* 44, no. 2 (1963): 206–209.
Meijerin, E. P. "Cyril of Alexandria on the Platonists and the Trinity." In *God Being History*, 114–127. Amsterdam: Oxford, 1975.
____. "Some reflections on Cyril of Alexandria's Rejection of Anthropomorphism." In *God Being History*, 128–132. Amsterdam: Oxford, 1975.
Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York: American Bible Society, 1994.
Meunier, B. "Cyrille d'Alexandrie au Concile de Florence." *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 21 (1989): 147–74.
____. *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie. L'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite*. Théologie historique 104. Paris: Beauchesne, 1997.
Meyendorff, John. "Chalcedonians and Monophysites after Chalcedon." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10, no. 2 (1964–5): 16–30.
____. *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.
____. "Ἐφ ᾧ'(Rom 5:12) chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Théodoret." *Studia Patristica* 4 (1961): 157–161.

Meyer, R. T. "Palladius and the Study of Scripture." *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 487–90.

_____., trans. *Palladius: The Lausiac History*. Vol. 43. Ancient Christian Writers. New York: The Paulist Press, n.d.

Michel, A. "Idiomes (Communication des)." *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. 7 (1922): 595–602.

Michaud, E. "S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'Eucharistie." *Revue Internationale de Théologie* 10 (1902): 599–614, 675–92.

Millar, F. "The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity AD 312–438." In *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, ed. J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak, 97–123. London: Routledge, 1992.

Moeller, C. "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle." In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*. Edited by A. Grillmeier. Vol. 1, 637–720. Wüzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1951.

Moignt, Joseph. "La réception du Prologue de Jean au IIe siècle." *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses* 83 (1995): 249–282.

Morgan, Robert, and John Barton, ed. and trans. *Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Muddiman, John. "The New Testament: The Tradition of Interpretation." *Companion Encyclopedia of Theology* (1995): 102–121.

Munier, H. "Le lieu de naissance de Saint Cyril d'Alexandrie." In *Kyrilliana*, 199–201. Le Caire: Les Éditions du Scribe Egyptien, 1947.

Murphy, James, ed. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*. New York: Random House, 1972.

Nau, F. "Saint Cyrille et Nestorius: Contribution à l'histoire des origines des schismes monophysite et nestorien." *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 15 (1910): 365–91; (1911): 1–54.

Nédoncelle, M. "Prosopon et persona dans l'antiquité classique." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 22 (1948): 277–299.

Neeb, John H. C. "Essays in the History of Interpretation." *Consensus* 23, no. 1 (1997): 7–49.

Neg, K. K. "The Soul of Christ in Athanasius." *Coptic Church Review* 22 (Spring 2000): 23–31.

Newman, J. H. "On St. Cyril's formula: Mia Physis Sesarkomene." In *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, 328–382. Westminster, MD.: Christian Classics, 1974.

Norris, R. A. "Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 255–68.

____. *Manhood in Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Oxford: At Clarendon University Press, 1963.

____. "The Problem of Human Identity in Patristic Christological Speculation." *Studia Patristica* 17/1 (1982): 147–59.

O'Keefe, John. "Christianizing Malachi: Fifth-Century Insights from Cyril of Alexandria." *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 no. 2 (1996): 136–58.

____. "Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology." *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 39–60.

____. "Interpreting the Angel. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentators on the Book of Malachi." Ph.D. Diss., The Catholic University of America, 1993.

____. "Kenosis or Impassibility: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus on the Problem of Divine Pathos." *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997): 358–65.

____. "'A Letter that Killeth': Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 83–104.

____. "The Peril and the Promise of Patristic Exegesis." In *Practical Theology: Perspectives from the Plains*, ed. Michael G. Lawler and Gail R. Risch. 144–161. Omaha, Nev.: Creighton University Press, 2000.

Olbright, Thomas. "Delivery and Memory." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 159–167. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church, Volume 1, the Biblical Period*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

The Order of the Fraction of the Priesthood and Consecrating the Altar Utensils. Diocese of Beni Suef and Bahnasa, 1992.

Orientalis ecclesiae decus: encyclical letter of Pope Pius XII on St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, on the fifteenth centenary of his most holy death. Washington D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1944.

Pagels, E. *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis. Heracleon's Commentary on John*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1989.

Pancaro, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity according to John*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Papadopoulos, Chr. *Ho Hagios Kyrillos Alexandreias*. Alexandria: Patriarchal Press, 1995.

Paradise of the Fathers. Diocese of Beni Suef and Bahnasa, 1977.

Parson, Peter, ed. and trans. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 33. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1968.

Parvis, P. M. "The Commentary on Hebrews and the Contra Theodorum of Cyril of Alexandria." *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1975): 415–19.

Pazzini, Domenico. "Il Prologo di Giovanni in Cirillo di Alessandria."*Studi Biblici*, no. 116. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1997.

Pelikan, Yaroslav. "Exegesis and the History of Theology." In *Luther's Works*. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1959.

Petit, F. *La chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale I-IV*. Traditio Exegetica Graeca 4. 1996.

Philipsborn, A. "La compagnie d'ambulanciers 'Parabalani' d'Alexandrie." *Byzantion* 20 (1950): 185–90.

Poffet, Jean-Michael. *La méthode exégétique d'Héracléon et d'Origine: commentateurs de Jn 4. Jésus, la Samaritaine et les samaritains*. Freiburg: Éditions Universitaires Freiburg Suisse, 1985.

Pollard, T. E. "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 41 (1958–59): 414–29.

Porter, Stanley, ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Prestige, G. L. *Fathers and Heretics. Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue*. London: SPCK, 1940.

____. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: SPCK, 1977.

Quasten, J. *Patrology*. 4 vols. Texas: Christian Classics, A Division of Thomas More Publishing, n.d.

Rand, Laurence. *Flesh and Spirit, a Study of Eucharistic Deification in Cyril of Alexandria*. MA. Thesis, University of California Berkley, 1983.

Rehrmann, A. *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*. Hildesheim: 1902.

Renaudin, P. *La Théologie de saint Cyrille*. Tongerloo: 1937.

Reuss, Joseph. "Cyril von Alexandrien und sein Kommentar zum Johannes Evangelium." *Biblica* 25 (1944): 207–209.

Richard, M. "Deux lettres perdues de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 274–277.

____. "Le pape Léon le Grand et les Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 40 (1952): 116–128.

____. "Les Traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse." *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, 1 (1946): 99–116, Paris: En dépôt chez Mme Pecqueur-Grat.

____. "L'introduction du mot 'Hypostase' dans la théologie de l'Incarnation." *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 2 (1945): 5–32, 243–70.

____. "Proclus de Constantinople et la théopaschisme." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 38 (1942): 303–331.

Roberts, W. Rhys. *Greek Rhetoric and Library Cristicism*. New York: Cooper Square, 1963.

Romanides, J. S. "St. Cyril's 'One physis or hypostasis of God the Logos incarnate' and Chalcedon." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 (1964–65): 82–107.

Rosa, Pietro. *Gli Occhi del Corpo. Gli Occhi della Mente. Cirillo Alessandrino: testi ermeneutici*. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1994.

Rougé, J. "Les débuts de l'épiscopat de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le *Code Théodosien*." In *Alexandrina. Hellénisme, judaisme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondesert*, 339–49. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1987.

____. "La politique de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le meurtre d'Hypatie." *Cristianesimo nella storia* 11/3 (1990): 485–504.

Rowe, Galen. "Style." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 121–157. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Russell, Norman. *Cyril of Alexandria*. The Early Church Fathers, ed. Carol Harrison. New York: Routledge, 2000.

____. "'Partakers of the divine nature' (2 Peter 1:4) in the Byzantine Tradition." In *Kathegetria. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday*, 51–67. Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 1988.

Saddington, D. B. "The Function of Education according to Christian Writers of the Later Part of the Fourth Century A.D." *Acta Classica*, 3 (1996): 86–101.

Samuel, V. C. "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 (1964): 37–53.

Santer, H. "The Authorship and Occasion of Cyril of Alexandria's Sermon on the Virgin (Hom. Diversae iv)." *Studia Patristica* 12 (1975): 144–50.

Sauer, J. *Die Exegese des Cyrill von Alexandrien nach seinem Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium*. Freiburg: 1965.

Sauget, Joseph-Marie. "Nouvelles homélies du Commentaire sur l'Évangile de S. Luc de Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans leur traduction syriaque." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 197 (1974): 439–456.

Schafer, A. "Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien in der römischen Kirche (432–534)." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 77 (1895): 421–47.

Schäferdiek, K. "Theodor von Mopsuestia als Exeget des vierten Evangeliums." *Studia Patristica* 10 (1970): 242–247.

Schenkeveld, Dirk. "Philosophical Prose." *In Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*. Ed. Stanley Porter, 195–264. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Schmidt, Margot and Carl Geyer, eds. *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den Östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*. Friedrich Pustet, 1982.

Schubart, W. "Parabalani," *Journal of Egyptian Archaelogy* 40 (1954): 47–57.

Schwartz, H. *Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor*. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 208,4. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928.

Sellers, R. V. *Two Ancient Christologies. A Study in the Christological Thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine*. London: SPCK, 1954.

____. *The Council of Chalcedon. A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*. London: SPCK, 1961.

Siddals, R. M. "Oness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 18 (1985): 207–11.

____. "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38, (1987): 341–67.

____. "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1984.

Siedlecki, Edmund J. "A Patristic synthesis of John VI, 54–55." S.T.D. Thesis, Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1956.

Simonetti, Manlio. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. Translated by John A. Hughes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Slusser, Michael. "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology." *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 461–76.

Smith, Robert W. *The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria. Its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.

Soro, A. Bawai. "La condamnation de Nestorius au concile d'Ephèse." *Istina* 43, no. 2 (1998): 179–213.

Spira, Andreas. "The Impact of Christianity on Ancient Rhetoric." *Studia Patristica* 18.2 (1989): 137–53.

Starowieyski, M. "Le titre theotokos avant le concile d'Ephèse." *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 236–42.

Stead, C. "The Significance of the Homoousios," *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961): 397–412.

------. "The Concept of Divine Substance." *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975): 1–14.

Takács, Sarolta A. "Hypatia's murder – The Sacrifice of a Virgin and Its Implications." In *The Formulation of Christianity by Conflict through the Ages*, ed. Katharine B. Free. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1995.

Telfer, William. "The Fourth Century Greek Fathers as Exegetes." *Harvard Theological Review* 50 (1957): 91–105.

Torannce, I. R. *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*. Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1988.

Trigg, Joseph Wilson. *Biblical Interpretation*. Message of the Fathers of the Church. Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1988.

____. "Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: Continuities and Discontinuities in their Approach to the Gospel of John." *Origeniana Octava II* (2003): 955–965.

Trispanlis, C. "Christological aspects of the thought of St. Cyril of Alexandria." In *Greek Patristic Theology*, 1–24. New York: 1979.

Turner, H. E. W. "Nestorius reconsidered." *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 306–21.

Van den Dries, J. *The formula of Saint Cyril of Alexandria μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκθμένη* Rome: 1939.

Veilleux, Armand., trans. *Pachomian Koinonia*. Vol. 1, *The Life of Saint Pachomius*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1980.

Visotzky, Burton L. "Jots and Tittles: On Scriptural Interpretation in Rabbinic and Patristic Literatures." *Prooftexts* 8 (1988): 257–269.

Voobus, A. *Discoveries of great import on the Commentary on Luke by Cyril of Alexandria: The emergence of new manuscripts sources for the Syriac version*. Stockholm: 1973.

Wace, Henry and William C. Piercy. *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography*. Hendrickson, 1999.

Walker, Jeffrey. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wallis, R. T. *Neo-Platonism*. London: Duckworth, 1972.

Ward, Benedicta., trans. *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1984.

Weinandy, Thomas G. "The Soul/Body Analogy and the Incarnation: Cyril of Alexandria." *Coptic Church Review* 17 (1996): 59–66.

____, and Daniel Keating, eds. *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria*. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.

Welch, Lawrence, J. *Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria*. San Francisco and London: Catholic Scholars Press, 1994.

____. "Logos-Sarx? Sarx and the Soul of Christ in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 271–92.

Wessel, Susan. *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy, The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Wickham, Lionel R., ed. and trans. *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters*. Oxford Early Christian Texts, ed. Henry Chadwick. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1983.

____. "Cyril of Alexandria and the apple of discord." *Studia Patristica* 15 (1984): 379–392.

____. "Symbols of the Incarnation in Cyril of Alexandria." In *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bie den Östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, eds. M. Schmidt and C. F. Geyer, 41–53. Regensburg: 1982.

Wiles, Maurice F. *The Spiritual Gospel. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

____. "The Nature of the Early Debate about Christ's Human Soul." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965): 139–51.

Wilken, R. L. "Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Iulianum*." In *The Limits of Ancient Christianity*, ed. W. Klingshirn, 42–55. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

____. "Exegesis and History." *Church History* 34 (1966): 139–56.

____. "Exegesis and the History of Theology: Some Reflections on the Adam-Christ Typology in Cyril of Alexandria." *Church History* 35 (1966): 139–156.

____. "In Dominico Eloquio: Learning the Lord's Style of Language, Cyril of Alexandria on messianic prophecy in Isaiah." *Communio* 24 (1997): 846–866.

____. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind. A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971.

____. "St. Cyril of Alexandria: Biblical Expositor." *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998): 30–41.

____. "St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Mystery of Christ in the Bible." *Pro Ecclesia* 4 (1995): 454–478.

____. "Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies." *Church History* 34 (1965): 123–145.

Williams, R., ed. *The making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honor of Henry Chadwick*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wolfson, H. A. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Arrangement." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley Porter, 51–87. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Yanney, Rodolph. "Life and Work of Saint Cyril of Alexandria." *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998): 17–29.

____. "Saint Cyril of Alexandria: Pillar of Faith." *Coptic Church Review* 19 (1998).

Young, Frances M. "A Reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1971): 103–14.

____. "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading." In *The Open Text*, ed. Francis Watson, 103–120. London: SCM Press, 1993.

____. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.

____. "Exegetical Method and Scriptural Proof: The Bible in Doctrinal Debate." *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 291–304.

____. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. London: SCM Press, 1983.

____. "The Rhetorical Schools and their Influence on Patristic Exegesis." In *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honor of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams, 182–199. CUP, 1989.

____. *Virtuoso Theology: The Bible and Interpretation*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press, 1993.

Zaharopoulos, Dimitri. *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

INDEX

Aeschylus, 44
Aim/σκοπός, 110, 127, 164, 244
Alexander of Alexandria, 51, 72
Alexandria, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, 30, 31, 33, 36, 38, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 65, 67, 71, 72, 73, 75, 79, 99, 109, 112, 121, 123, 129, 134, 143, 152, 170, 175, 181, 183, 184, 186, 196, 205, 218, 236, 241, 242, 244, 245, 246, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256
  Church of, 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 22, 31, 33, 35, 51, 59, 72, 75, 256
  School of, 47, 55, 56, 59, 68, 72
  See of, 22, 55
Ambrose of Milan, 50
Anthropomorphite, 18
Antony, 16, 17, 19, 22, 28, 55
Apollinaris, 47
Apologetic, 78
Apostolic Constitution, 34, 35
Appollinarian, 57
Argumentation, 8, 10, 53, 74, 136, 174, 181, 186, 188, 194, 197, 219, 243, 259
Arian, 7, 17, 22, 57, 62, 71, 85, 88, 93, 97, 101, 106, 113, 144, 158, 159, 198, 219, 257
  Arianism, 17, 102
  Arius, 1, 71, 75, 77, 112, 166, 181, 188, 198
Ascetic, 1, 2, 3, 17, 23, 26, 30, 55
Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, 1, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 31, 38, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59, 61, 67, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 99, 100, 109, 110, 112, 118, 121, 124, 129, 133, 135, 145, 194, 197, 240, 244, 256
Augustine, Saint, 49, 60, 65, 66, 151, 152, 196
Basil, Bishop of Cappadocia, 15, 50, 54, 74, 82, 151, 194
Begotten, 63, 81, 84, 87, 89, 101, 104, 116, 125, 163, 189, 239, 248, 249
Bible/Biblical, 47, 68, 71, 72, 145, 149, 154, 162, 171, 174, 188, 195, 199, 222, 242, 250, 252, 253
Body, 76, 130, 221
Bread, 25, 158, 163, 216, 219, 220, 221, 222, 247, 248, 249, 251, 252
Byzantium, 33, 35

Catholic, 1, 12, 13, 14, 22, 107, 121, 160
Child, 3, 13, 41, 42, 43, 122, 136, 191, 256
Christ, 1, 2, 9, 10, 19, 21, 24, 26, 35, 46, 47, 57, 58, 61, 73, 79, 80, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 131, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 158, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 173, 174, 178, 179, 182, 186, 189, 190, 191, 192, 196, 200, 204, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 257, 260
Clement of Alexandria, 15, 72, 152, 178, 181, 230, 244
Climados, 23
Commentary on the Gospel of John, Johannine Commentary, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 25, 50, 57, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 71, 73, 75, 85, 98, 99, 123, 150, 154, 160, 171, 174, 178, 182, 255, 256, 260
Consubstantial, 63, 78, 81, 85, 87, 89, 90, 95, 100, 108
Contra Iulianum, 177, 180, 182, 183
Coptic, 1, 3, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 30, 35, 40, 41, 61, 112, 121, 130, 185, 245
Corruption, 75, 76, 116, 118, 125, 134, 135, 141, 221, 250
Creation, 76, 77, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 96, 98, 102, 103, 109, 110, 122, 123, 132, 134, 135, 140, 141, 145, 147, 172, 189, 255, 257, 258
Creator, 91, 257
Culture, 24, 25, 46, 47, 48, 59, 153, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 197, 209, 242
  Christian, 59
  Greek, 47, 174, 175, 176, 177, 181, 182, 197
  Hellenistic, 25, 48
Cyprian of Carthage, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 50
Cyril of Alexandria, Pope, Bishop, Patriarch,
  Deacon, 30
  Exegete/interpreter, 1, 2, 4, 9, 68, 150, 157, 244, 255, 256
  Priest, 40
  Theologian, 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 114, 140, 184, 185
De Adoratione, 60, 62, 187, 230, 237
De Trinitate Dialogi VII, 62, 187
Death, 4, 6, 11, 13, 17, 19, 30, 36, 47, 52, 55, 63, 67, 76, 77, 104, 109, 111, 114, 116, 117, 118, 125, 131, 134, 135, 141, 146, 171, 175, 190, 191, 192, 193, 221, 229, 234, 240, 257
Deification/Deify, 87, 93, 100, 118, 145

Didymus the Blind, 8, 38, 50, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 72, 74, 113, 129, 156, 171, 194, 233
διήγησις, 193, 197, 201, 206
Dionysius Thrax of Alexandria, 15, 45, 72, 161, 162, 166, 169, 170, 174
Disciple/Discipleship, 3, 13, 15, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 181, 213
Divinity/Divine, 1, 2, 16, 25, 26, 38, 71, 77, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 123, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 144, 146, 159, 166, 171, 177, 179, 193, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 212, 213, 215, 220, 222, 229, 232, 233, 235, 242, 243, 244, 248, 253, 254, 257, 258
Doctrine, 15, 46, 56, 64, 71, 72, 74, 77, 97, 98, 112, 119, 121, 123, 128, 135, 185, 187, 194, 195, 244, 246
Duality, 85, 93, 109, 123, 258
Education
  Primary Education, 40, 42, 43, 64, 67
  Secondary Education, 40, 44, 45, 64
Egypt, 3, 9, 13, 16, 17, 35, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 52, 53, 55, 67, 157, 161, 170, 171, 172, 248, 256
Egyptian, 2, 3, 5, 12, 17, 22, 41, 46, 67, 171, 172, 182
Egyptian Cities
  Mahalle, 13, 67
  Memphis, 12, 67
  Pelusium, 16, 20
Empire, 2, 3, 5, 6, 40, 41, 46, 47, 48, 50, 153, 161, 184
  Eastern, 46
Enigma, enigmatic, enigmatically, 10, 202, 205, 212, 215, 220, 226, 234, 235, 236, 238, 253, 260
Epiphanius, 23, 74, 194
Eucharist/Eucharistic, 25, 53, 122, 123, 131, 134, 208, 222, 240
Eunomius, 71, 158, 187, 194
Eusebius of Caesarea, 15, 20, 54, 65, 66, 152, 171
Exegesis, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 24, 44, 45, 65, 68, 73, 80, 87, 101, 107, 109, 118, 123, 136, 144, 149, 150, 151, 153, 156, 157, 159, 161, 165, 170, 174, 175, 181, 183, 199, 200, 201, 203, 205, 208, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219, 220, 222, 231, 234, 236, 237, 240, 242, 244, 245, 246, 249, 251, 252, 253, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 269
  Dogmatic, 8, 71, 155, 158, 190, 197, 257
  Spiritual, 8, 149, 159, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 206, 208, 220, 223, 232, 252, 253, 254, 260
Exodus, 98, 155, 203, 207, 215, 227, 231, 249, 251
Faith, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26, 33, 36, 71, 74, 78, 79, 82, 83, 90, 108, 120, 145, 158, 167, 177, 186, 195, 200, 204, 218, 226, 229, 233, 240, 252, 254

Father (Power of Father, Wisdom of Father), 5, 10, 18, 29, 63, 71, 73, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 115, 118, 119, 127, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 163, 166, 170, 178, 183, 186, 202, 203, 207, 211, 212, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, 232, 233, 234, 238, 247, 257, 258, 260
Felix of Rome, 50
Festal Letters, 11, 50
Figure/σχῆμα, 240, 254
First Apology, 32
Flesh, 79, 86, 87, 97, 100, 102, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117, 120, 124, 126, 127, 130, 131, 132, 137, 138, 141, 145, 146, 147, 167, 190, 192, 231, 239, 246, 248, 249, 252, 257
Free Choice, 73, 94
Free Will, 76, 94
φύσις/Nature, 81, 184
Fullness, 74, 82, 103, 111, 118, 133, 137, 203, 243
Gabriel, 91
Galilee, 164, 172, 173, 200, 207, 213, 217, 226, 227
Geography, 10, 154, 170, 171, 172, 174, 196, 213, 258
Glaphyres, 60
God/Godhead, 1, 2, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 34, 37, 58, 63, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 119, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 163, 166, 167, 179, 181, 183, 186, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 202, 203, 212, 215, 218, 219, 222, 224, 227, 232, 234, 235, 243, 245, 246, 247, 248, 251, 257, 258
Gospel, 7, 8, 10, 15, 24, 25, 33, 34, 54, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 71, 73, 76, 82, 99, 103, 107, 117, 120, 124, 142, 143, 150, 156, 158, 159, 160, 162, 166, 174, 200, 204, 205, 206, 208, 214, 222, 228, 231, 235, 237, 240, 242, 250, 256, 257, 259, 260, 263, 264, 265
Gospel of Luke, 7, 62, 65, 69, 73, 91, 118, 120, 124, 155, 156, 212, 241, 242, 250
Gospel of Mark, 7
Gospel of Matthew, 7, 34, 62, 156
Gospel-exegete, 68, 256, 259
Grammar, 10, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 51, 150, 154, 166, 167, 183, 196, 253, 258
Grammarian(s), 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 56, 68, 150, 152, 157, 159, 161, 162, 166, 168, 169, 170, 172, 174, 182, 196, 199, 218, 246, 253, 258
Greek, 1, 4, 8, 17, 20, 33, 37, 40, 41, 44, 46, 47, 77, 98, 105, 129, 150, 151, 152, 154, 162, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180,

181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 194, 197, 206, 236, 243, 250, 256, 258, 259
Greek Philosophy, 4, 154, 175, 178, 181
Gregory Nazianzen, 50, 100, 112
Gregory of Nyssa, 50, 74, 105, 194, 244
Hellenistic, 25, 40, 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 150, 154, 176, 177, 183, 187, 206
Heresy, 7, 8, 21, 22, 50, 71, 115, 144, 158, 159, 194, 232
Heretic/Heretics/Heretical, 2, 4, 5, 8, 17, 26, 32, 40, 50, 57, 71, 73, 75, 85, 97, 102, 154, 155, 158, 162, 166, 186, 187, 189, 194, 195, 197, 206, 207, 219, 232, 243, 255, 259, 261
His own/ἴδιον, 79, 80, 112, 115, 126, 138, 140, 169
Historical Discourse, 200, 244
ἱστορίας, 220, 244
ἱστορίας λόγος, 200
Holy Spirit/Spirit/Paraclete, 5, 10, 16, 35, 73, 74, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 105, 108, 110, 111, 115, 117, 118, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 159, 160, 162, 177, 189, 201, 210, 211, 225, 228, 231, 233, 257, 258
Homer, 44, 45, 46, 47, 173, 180, 195, 199, 209, 243
Humanity/Human, 1, 2, 25, 57, 76, 77, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96, 100, 101, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132, 134, 137, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 178, 200, 201, 202, 205, 215, 221, 224, 234, 240, 242, 243, 244, 246, 251, 257, 258
Image, 27, 28, 76, 77, 80, 81, 84, 102, 104, 112, 133, 134, 137, 140, 142, 144, 164, 180, 183, 202, 209, 212, 215, 223, 224, 243, 245
Immaterial, 76
Immutable, 58
Impassable/Impassibility, 116
Impress/χαρακτὴρ, 84, 93, 104, 142, 163, 207, 219
Incarnate, 1, 2, 57, 76, 77, 78, 79, 91, 103, 113, 115, 117, 119, 122, 124, 125, 127, 129, 131, 132, 135, 145, 146, 147, 258
Incarnation, 1, 2, 10, 25, 57, 63, 75, 76, 77, 78, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 137, 141, 145, 146, 147, 186, 189, 193, 203, 222, 224, 225, 234, 257, 258, 260
Incorporeal, 76, 97, 130
Incorruptible/Incorruptibility, Incorruption, 76, 77, 116, 117, 118, 131, 135, 141, 193, 222, 250, 251
Intellectual/Intellectuality, 2, 4, 12, 19, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 94, 149, 241
Isidore of Pelusium, 16, 20, 21
Isocrates, 176

Jerome, 18, 19, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 74, 155, 171, 244, 250
Jew/Judaism/Jewish, 4, 5, 8, 24, 78, 79, 107, 109, 136, 143, 163, 165, 168, 187, 200, 211, 213, 217, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 244, 245, 247, 250, 251, 254, 259, 264
John Chrysostom, 3, 8, 11, 13, 17, 37, 44, 49, 52, 53, 60, 105, 151, 152, 155, 158, 174, 196, 244, 259
  Tall Brothers, 53
John of Nikiu, 13, 30, 51
Joseph, Abba, 25, 28, 29, 67, 97, 112, 241, 264
Josephus, 182, 244
Julian of Rome, 50
Julian, the Apostate, 46, 47, 180
Justin Martyr, 32, 187
Kenosis, 87
Knowledge, 3, 4, 18, 24, 36, 38, 39, 44, 45, 47, 55, 72, 75, 80, 81, 84, 94, 96, 101, 102, 104, 118, 119, 120, 152, 154, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 212, 226, 229, 240, 242, 250
Latin, translation, 18, 53, 54, 55, 59
Law, 5, 35, 48, 50, 60, 76, 80, 98, 103, 106, 110, 111, 143, 146, 169, 179, 181, 187, 190, 201, 203, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216, 220, 225, 228, 229, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 243, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 252
Letters/Epistles, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 32, 33, 37, 50, 53, 62, 68, 105, 155
Libanius, 3, 40, 42, 44
Library/Libraries, 9, 49, 50, 61, 68, 150, 153, 231
Life, 22, 27, 53, 59, 106, 114, 123, 125, 146, 152, 158, 163, 222, 241, 252, 257
Literal Sense, 60, 205, 224
Literary (style), 152, 154, 183, 185, 186, 194, 197, 206, 259
Lot, Abba, 29
Luke/Lukan, 7, 62, 65, 69, 73, 91, 118, 120, 124, 155, 156, 212, 241, 242, 250
Macarius, Saint, 3, 14, 16, 18, 19, 27, 28, 30, 67
Manna, 159, 207, 208, 215, 219, 220, 221, 231, 244, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, *See also* Bread
Mark, 7, 27, 30, 51
Mary, 1, 24, 100, 136, 143, 164
Matthew, 7, 34, 62, 156
Meaning
  Deep(er), 207, 209, 210, 211, 216, 217, 228, 237, 238, 241, 260
  Hidden, 10, 204, 207, 212, 224, 236, 237, 253, 260
Menander, 41, 44
Mental contemplation, 103
Mental knowledge, 103
Monastery, 18
Monastic, 3, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 52, 59, 67
Monk(s), 1, 3, 6, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 54, 59, 67, 68, 75, 153
Moral, 42, 43, 45, 47, 52, 117, 150, 176, 177, 180, 194, 195,

197, 199, 207, 214, 216, 223, 253, 256
Moses, 27, 62, 80, 98, 103, 107, 133, 159, 163, 169, 192, 199, 202, 207, 208, 212, 213, 215, 216, 219, 221, 230, 231, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 251, 252
Nature/φύσις
one nature, 2, 61, 82, 91, 129, 130
two natures, 2, 79, 100
Neologism, 184, 186
Nestorius/Nestorian, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 21, 22, 60, 61, 62, 65, 67, 69, 73, 77, 98, 99, 112, 114, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 131, 139, 156, 170, 175, 181, 187, 245, 255, 258
Newness, 10, 73, 90, 110, 116, 117, 118, 122, 131, 132, 135, 136, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 229, 230, 247, 251, 257, 258
Newness of life, 10, 73, 110, 116, 117, 118, 122, 131, 132, 135, 136, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 229, 230, 251, 257, 258
Nicea/Nicean, 19, 75, 112
Nitria
Desert, 19, 26
Scetis, 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 18, 19
Oneness, 2, 9, 10, 73, 86, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 100, 115, 123, 128, 130, 131, 136, 138, 144, 145, 146, 163, 167, 237, 257
Only-Begotten, 81, 87, 116, 125, 189, 239, 248, 249
Operation/Activity/ἐνέργειαι/ἐνέργείας/ἐνέργεια, 94, 96, 129, 131, 139
Oration, 100, 194
Origen, 8, 15, 18, 38, 53, 54, 55, 57, 65, 71, 72, 105, 107, 136, 155, 156, 158, 160, 173, 174, 178, 188, 189, 195, 201, 233, 238, 240, 243, 244, 267
Origenist, 3, 7, 36, 52, 53, 55, 67, 68, 256
Orthodox, 1, 129
οὐσία/Essence, 81, 87, 91, 94, 97
Pachomian/Pachomius, 18, 20, 22, 27, 59
Paideia, 17, 153, 178, 256
Palladius, 17, 59, 72
Paphnotius, 27
Parabalani, 5, 50
Paschal, 4, 53, 54, 62, 68, 129
Paschal canon, 53
Paschal Letter(s), 4, 53, 54, 62, 68, 129
Patriarchate, 13, 14, 19, 37, 47, 50, 51, 59, 65, 66, 256
Patriarchal Residence, 10, 33, 43, 45, 48, 51, 52, 59, 65, 66, 67, 68, 256
Paul/Pauline, 14, 25, 77, 81, 83, 95, 111, 126, 133, 137, 138, 153, 156, 167, 194, 203, 223, 225, 228, 251
Paula, 19, 53
Pedagogue/παιδαγωγός, 42, 43
Person, 103
Peter of Alexandria, 50, 51, 72
Philosopher, 6, 40, 151, 195
Philosophy/φιλοσοφία, 177
Plato, 55, 112, 129, 176, 180, 181
Properties/ἰδιωμάτων, 81, 85

Pulcheria, 21
Punctuation, 45, 161, 162, 166, 167, 168, 196, 259
Quaternity, 145
Quintilian, 40, 150, 153, 161, 177, 183, 187, 194
Quod Unus sit Christus, 187
Reader/*anagnostes*/ἀναγνώστης, 4, 9, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 68
Renewal, 110, 116, 118, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146
Resurrection, 59
Rhetor, 3, 4, 40, 47, 48, 150, 151, 152, 217, 242
Rhetoric, 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 36, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 51, 65, 68, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 161, 176, 177, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 205, 206, 209, 236, 253, 259, 260
Rhetorical School, 151, 161, 198
Roman, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 40, 41, 47, 150, 153, 161, 184
Rome, 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 50, 152
Rufinus of Aquileia, 52, 55
Sacrifice, 106, 146, 192, 226, 228, 243, 249
Salvation, 1, 2, 27, 28, 77, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 100, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, 121, 124, 125, 131, 135, 141, 142, 186, 226, 228, 238, 239, 249
Sanctification, Sanctify, 87, 117, 118, 120, 121, 125, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139, 140, 142, 144, 147, 258
Savior, 38, 90, 106, 142, 160, 191, 192, 193, 210, 213, 220, 222, 228, 243, 245, 250
Scholastic, 16, 19, 42
School
  Primary, 40, 42, 43
  Secondary, 46
Scriptures, 3, 13, 14, 31, 50, 55, 56, 64, 65, 127, 161, 166, 168, 171, 177, 222, 231, 242, 251
Seal/Impress, 163
Serapion of Thmuis, 16
Serapion the Wise, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 28, 30, 67, 256
Serapium/Temple of Serapis, 52
Severus, Bishop of El-Ashmunien, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 30, 36, 37, 45, 48, 59, 67, 189
  History of the Patriarchs, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 30, 189
Shadow, 116, 176, 177, 210, 225, 229, 231, 238, 250
Sign, 125, 239
Silvanus, Abba, 27, 81
Sin, 23, 57, 58, 111, 116, 135, 138, 146, 190, 192, 193, 204, 238, 252, 257
Sinlessness (of Christ), 58
Son/Word, i, 1, 2, 5, 10, 23, 63, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 163, 166, 167, 170, 178, 186, 188, 189, 193, 200, 202, 203, 207, 211, 212, 219, 222, 234,

235, 239, 243, 244, 247, 248, 251, 257, 258, 260
Sophocles, 44
Soul, 8, 20, 23, 24, 57, 91, 94, 111, 112, 115, 121, 125, 130, 131, 135, 137, 140, 142, 160, 163, 190, 191, 211, 239, 251
Sozomen, 11, 17, 19, 51
Spiritual
Exegesis, 8, 159, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 206, 208, 220, 223, 232, 252, 253, 254, 260
Interpretation, 8, 10, 197, 204, 205, 208, 218, 222, 223, 229, 231, 232, 253, 260
Meaning, 174, 205, 214, 217, 218, 223, 225, 226, 228, 231, 233, 239, 253, 254, 260
Spirituality, 3, 25, 26, 27, 29, 67, 73, 149, 155, 159, 197, 201, 204
Style, 10, 20, 45, 48, 69, 74, 144, 149, 151, 152, 153, 160, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 193, 196, 197, 220, 240, 250, 252, 259
Syllogism, 193, 194, 206
Synod at Hippo, 39
Synod of the Oaks, 11, 30, 33, 37, 65, 68
Teach, 14, 38, 39, 56, 120, 157, 185
Teacher/διδασκάλος, 3, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29, 32, 37, 38, 45, 48, 54, 55, 57, 67, 68, 99, 149, 174, 185, 186, 188, 197, 199, 259
Tertullian, 32, 152, 154, 187
Testament, 6, 7, 8, 10, 31, 32, 44, 54, 63, 68, 72, 98, 105, 107, 118, 133, 141, 143, 152, 156, 159, 172, 174, 175, 181, 188, 191, 194, 197, 200, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 216, 219, 220, 223, 224, 225, 229, 230, 231, 236, 237, 242, 243, 244, 247, 252, 253, 254, 260, 264
Epistles, 7, 14, 32, 156, 216
New Testament, 6, 7, 8, 14, 24, 31, 44, 47, 49, 68, 72, 98, 105, 107, 118, 133, 154, 162, 174, 191, 193, 194, 200, 205, 206, 207, 211, 213, 216, 217, 220, 224, 225, 229, 236, 243, 244, 251, 252, 254
Old Testament, 6, 8, 10, 16, 32, 54, 63, 68, 72, 98, 107, 127, 133, 141, 143, 152, 156, 159, 170, 172, 174, 175, 181, 188, 191, 197, 200, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 219, 220, 223, 225, 229, 230, 231, 236, 237, 241, 242, 243, 244, 247, 252, 253, 254, 260, 264
Theophilus, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 27, 30, 31, 33, 36, 43, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, 64, 65, 67, 72, 74, 75, 170, 256
Theotokos/θεοτοκόκος, 1
Thesaurus, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 74, 75, 98, 113, 128, 145, 180, 183, 194
Thought/ἐπινοὶα, 93
Timothy Ailuros, 53
Timothy, archdeacon, 30
Title
Almighty, 124
King, 20, 217

Life, 22, 27, 53, 59, 106, 114, 123, 125, 146, 152, 158, 163, 222, 241, 252, 257
Light, 107, 167, 188, 189, 193, 210
Lord, 26, 31, 38, 39, 79, 83, 98, 103, 106, 112, 120, 124, 126, 137, 164, 167, 200, 201, 203, 217, 219, 223, 230, 232, 235, 245, 247, 248, 251
Transgression, 76, 109, 141, 192, 234
Trinity/Triune, 2, 7, 9, 10, 36, 57, 63, 71, 73, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 108, 115, 127, 128, 131, 134, 135, 138, 139, 144, 145, 146, 147, 161, 178, 228, 237, 257, 258, 260
Truth, 95, 136, 138, 139, 141, 142, 144
Type/τύπος, 225
Unchangeable/Unchangeablenes s, 71, 116, 146
Union, 130, 134
Unity, 123
of the Godhead, 82, 88, 91
Unity of Nature, 79
Will/βουλάς, 73, 95
Free Choice, 73, 94
Free Will, 76, 94
Wisdom, 89, 94, 193
Work/ἐνέργεια, 94, 96, 129, 131, 139